

Concordia Theological Monthly

Vol. XIV

AUGUST, 1943

No. 8

Μετάνοια

The Greek word μετάνοια, *metanoia*, occurs in the New Testament some 24 times, and is rendered in our English version with "repentance." The verb μετανοέω, *metanoeo*, which occurs some 31 times, is translated with "repent." Luther uses the word *Busse*, except in 2 Cor. 7:9, 10, where he renders μετάνοια with *Reue*, and the verb he translates with *Busse tun*, except in Luke 13:3, 5 and 17:3, where he has *sich bessern*, and in Luke 17:4, where he has *reuen*.

None of these translations expresses adequately the basic meaning of the Greek terms. *Repentance*, like the Latin *poenitentia*, has a strong connotation of sorrow, German *Reue*. And the German word *Busse* carries with it the idea of making amends by paying or suffering a penalty. *Sich bessern* is an inevitable result of μετανοεῖν, but this idea is not contained in the original concept of the verb.

Christ came to call sinners εἰς μετάνοιαν, Luke 5:32, and in Luke 24:47 He tells us that μετάνοια εἰς (καί) ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν should be preached in His name among all nations. As the immediate purpose our preaching, then, is to bring about a μετάνοια in them that hear us, it must be of interest and practical importance to us to understand what this *metanoia* really implies.

I

Etymology.—The word μετάνοια is derived from the verb μετανοέω, a compound of μετά, *after*, and νοέω, *I see, recognize*, also *think, ponder*. As distinguished from the idea, knowledge, sentiment, before one acts, it denotes the idea, knowledge, sentiment, one has after an act, occurrence, or experience. And as this "after-knowledge" is often quite different from the "fore-knowledge," the verb means to change one's mind. Schenkl, *Woerterbuch*, gives this definition: "Eigentlich hinterdrein einsehen, er-

kennen, d. h., danach seine Meinung, seinen Sinn oder Entschluss aendern." Vincent, *Word Studies*, Vol. I, p. 23, has this under *metanoieite*: "A word compounded of the preposition *meta*, after, with, and the verb *noeo*, to perceive and to think, as the result of perceiving and observing. In this compound the preposition combines the two meanings of time and change, which may be denoted by after and different; the whole compound means to *think differently after*. *Metanoia* (repentance) is therefore primarily an *after-thought*, different from the former thought; then a change of mind, which issues in regret and in a change of conduct. The latter ideas, however, have been imported into the word by Scriptural usage, and do not lie in it etymologically nor by primary usage. . . . Sorrow is not, as is popularly conceived, the primary nor the prominent notion of the word. Paul distinguishes between sorrow (*lype*) and repentance (*metanoia*), and puts the one as the outcome of the other. 'Godly sorrow worketh repentance,' 2 Cor. 7:10."

Μετάνοια, then, means a change of mind, and when Christ exhorts us, μετανοείτε, Mark 1:15, He wants us to change our mind.

II

The Common *Metanoia*.—Men frequently change their minds in life. Before we, therefore, discuss the implications of the term *μετάνοια* as used in the Scriptures, it may be helpful to our understanding if first we speak of the change of mind in general and examine wherein it consists, and whereby it is brought about.

The *mind* of man denotes, in the first place, those psychic powers with which God endowed His rational creatures. In its wider sense it includes man's intellectual, emotional, and volitional faculties. This mind of man, though weakened by the fall of Adam into sin, is nevertheless a precious gift of God, who has given me "my reason and all my senses and still preserves them"; it is the psychic instrument with which man does his thinking, feeling, and willing. It is true, there is a difference in men as to the responsiveness of these mental powers to external stimuli and as to the precision of their functioning. By proper exercise they may be developed and strengthened; but they may also become weak, atrophied, and deranged. Yet their fundamental functions are alike in all rational beings and cannot be changed. When, therefore, we read, Ezek. 18:31: "Make you a new heart and a new spirit," and in Ps. 51:10: "Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit within me," the meaning is not that there should be a replacement of man's psychic equipment with an entirely new set of mental powers.

In the second place, the word *mind* may also refer to the things

with which the mind occupies itself, the things that are in the mind, the thoughts, ideas, and opinions, the emotions and feelings, the inclinations, desires, and intentions. And here, indeed, changes are possible and frequent. In fact, as we acquire new knowledge, have new experiences, and receive new impressions, as we meditate on what we know, remember what we had forgotten, and become conscious of what slumbered in us, there is a continuous change going on in our mind. Our consciousness is not a stagnant pool, but a running stream. There is no rational being whose mind is absolutely static, and no sane person is so set in his views and ways that new information and experience will not more or less change his mind. Yet this change does by no means denote a change in the mental structure of man, but rather a change in his views, his disposition and attitude; it is a change in his *Gesinnung*. This is also the meaning of the texts quoted above (Ezek. 18:31; Ps. 51:10); the mind (heart and spirit), viewed as a faculty of the soul, *seelisches Vermoege*n, is not renewed and changed, but what occupies this mind, the attitude it assumes, and the direction in which it tends, therein is the change. To put it very bluntly, the change is not in the psychic machinery, but in the material with which it works and the effects resulting therefrom.

This change of mind may be partial, modifying in part only the previous opinion and attitude of man; but it may also be so radical as to reverse his judgment and feeling. When the barbarians saw that Paul was bitten by a poisonous viper, they were convinced that he must be a murderer, "whom, though he had escaped the sea, yet vengeance suffered not to live." But when they saw that no harm came to him, they "changed their minds" (μεταβαλλόμενοι) and said that he was a god. Acts 28:2-6. Here we have a complete change of mind, a change in what they thought of Paul and how they felt towards him.

A change implies that a thing becomes what it was not before. While a thing may be changeable, there is no thing that possesses inherent power to change itself; there must be some influence originating in something else that causes the change. The changes we observe in the physical world, in nature, in botany, in biology, and in chemistry, are all due to the action of one thing upon the other. We may not always be able to discover the immediate or remote causes of the changes we observe; yet there is, no doubt, a cause for every effect. If it were possible to isolate an element completely, absolutely eliminating every possible influence that might work upon it, there could be no change.

It is even so with the mind of man. The things that are in the mind do not change, unless acted upon by something that enters our consciousness. There can be no change in our thoughts and

ideas, our emotions and feelings, and the consequent direction of our will, unless something new and different enters our mind. This new material may be obtained from outside sources, or it may by cogitation be developed and deduced from such knowledge as we already possess, or it may be that an idea or thought that was forgotten or repressed is remembered and receives new attention; at all events, if there is to be a change of mind, some new element must enter our consciousness to bring it about. And while our mental faculties apperceive this new knowledge, and may on the basis thereof develop new ideas, it is not these mental faculties that really cause the change of mind, but rather the new things we have learned and found.

Let us again refer to the case mentioned in Acts 28:2-6. What the barbarians thought of Paul and how they felt towards him, we learn from v. 4: "No doubt this man must be a murderer, whom, though he hath escaped the sea, yet vengeance suffered not to live." They expected that he should have swollen from the bite of the venomous viper or fallen down dead suddenly, v. 6. Now, what made them change their minds, saying that he was a god? They saw that no harm came to him. This was something new to them, something unheard of. And it was this new knowledge entering their minds that changed their opinion and attitude concerning Paul. Also in the fall of man, Gen. 3:1-6, we observe in Eve a change of mind brought on by the deceitful lies of Satan. Thus it is in every *μετάνοια*, or change of mind. It is never brought about by the mind itself, i. e., by the reason, the heart, and the will of man, for these are only the psychic instruments that apperceive what enters the mind and are affected and directed thereby. Whenever there is a change of mind, it is superinduced by new elements of knowledge, new impressions and experiences, or by greater attention and emphasis being given to such things as we knew and experienced before, but ignored or did not fully understand. This is true also of fickle persons, who frequently change their minds without apparent good reason; yet behind every whimsical change there is an idea or impression which momentarily engaged their consciousness.

Because these observations on the functions of the mind have some bearing also on the spiritual *μετάνοια*, discussed below, it may be profitable to examine this matter more in detail.

The intellect and the reason of man, though weakened by the Fall, are, nevertheless, precious gifts of God. But what is their function? They are the instruments by which we obtain knowledge. Aside from the knowledge of the Law which men have by nature, Rom. 2:15, and, perhaps, some general ideas, all knowledge comes to man through his senses by observation, experience, and

information. The intellect receives these impressions and converts them into ideas. Reason apperceives, interprets, and judges these new ideas in terms of the old or corrects and modifies the old on the basis of the new. By analyzing, comparing, combining certain elements of knowledge we also arrive at new judgments and conclusions. Even our imaginations are but the result of our putting together in a novel way materials that somehow are present in our mind. In all these operations, reason, and we here take the word in a wider sense as including *Verstand* and *Vernunft*, acts only as a psychic function, *seelisches Vermoegeen*, an instrument that works on and with such material as entered the mind through the senses. Wonderful as the function of reason may be, it is not infallible, it may err in what it learns and in the conclusions it draws. But in no case has it the power to create knowledge *ex nihilo*. Neither can it, of itself, change the knowledge it has acquired without additional knowledge or deeper insight into what it already knows. Furthermore, it is not reason as such that makes an impression on the heart to produce an emotional response, for this is done by what is in the mind.

The heart or the emotional faculty of the soul is also a precious gift of God. When God created man, He made him not merely an intelligent being, which is able to acquire and to retain knowledge; but He made him an emotional being, that is, a being which can be affected by such knowledge, and is therefore capable of impressions, feelings, and emotions. These emotions are the innermost reaction of the human soul to the knowledge of the mind; they show, not what we know, but how we feel about what we know. It is therefore not our knowledge, but rather the impression this knowledge makes on our hearts that determines our personal attitude. It is for this reason that we ask a person how he *feels* about what he has read or heard. Without this emotional responsiveness of his soul, man would be incapable of sorrow and joy, of fear and love, of despair and trust and hope, etc., and would remain absolutely impassive to whatever he learns or experiences.

Ideational emotions — it is of these we speak — do not simply happen without any cause whatsoever, but they are superinduced by an idea or thought in our minds. And the idea that is strongest and uppermost in our consciousness will for the time being determine the feeling we experience in the heart. We may compare the heart to the sounding board of a violin, which sympathetically vibrates at the tones produced on the strings. Yet the sounding board neither produces nor changes the vibrations; this is done on the strings of the instrument. Thus a change in the emotional attitude of man is not brought about by the heart itself, but by the thoughts and ideas that dominate the conscious-

ness of man and act upon his emotional susceptibility. The heart is capable of many and even of conflicting impressions and emotions, but of itself it can neither create nor change them. Nor does the heart as such initiate volition, but this is done by the emotions and feelings that sway and control the heart.

Nor can anyone change his mind by a mere act of his will. For the will is not a specific mental element that acts independently and of its own accord, but every case of conscious volition includes the entire mental activity, intellectual and emotional, inasmuch as it tends toward expression and action. Behind every instance of conscious volition lies an emotion, and behind every emotion lies a thought or an idea. For this reason we sometimes ask a person, why he did a certain thing, what was the idea behind the act. Even when a person tells us that he changed his mind and conduct of his own free will, there still lies behind this "free will" of his some thought-engendered and thought-controlled emotion. It is, therefore, not the will as such that determines and changes its own direction, but this is in all cases done by some idea and emotion which acts upon the will. Since the will acts only when acted upon, and never acts on its own impulse and initiative, it is evident that it cannot of itself bring about a change of mind. In fact, a change of mind includes a change in will, and for this reason such change cannot be initiated by the will, nor can it take place against the will.

We would not be understood as though we regarded the intellect, the heart, and the will as three distinct compartments of the soul; for in every case the entire soul is active. We are merely differentiating between the principal functions or actions of this one soul. The intellectual or rational faculty of the soul is that function by which it acquires and retains knowledge; the emotional faculty is that function whereby the soul shows how it inwardly feels about what it has learned; the volitional faculty is the tendency of the soul to express in some manner what it feels. While for a better understanding of the activity of the soul it is convenient to make this distinction, we must bear in mind that in each of these functions the entire soul is active.

These psychic faculties are engaged in every change of mind man may experience; yet they neither bring it about, nor can they hinder or prevent it. They are merely the mental instruments with which the Creator has equipped the rational soul of man and by means of which man apprehends, evaluates, and reacts to, those things with which he comes in contact. It is because of these mental faculties that man is not like a senseless block or stone, but is indeed capable of a μετάνοια. Yet it is perfectly proper to say that even in the ordinary affairs of life man does not change his mind by "his own reason, strength, and will."

What, then, brings about a change of mind? The gateways to the mind of man are his senses. If from his infancy these were completely shut off, his mind would, as far as we can see, remain almost absolutely blank; he could acquire no knowledge nor experience emotions and conscious volitions. His mental powers, no matter how keen they might otherwise be, would remain inactive, because they would have nothing to occupy them and to work on. It is through the senses that the soul has contact with the outside world, and what through the senses enters the mind is the stimulus that quickens the mental powers and starts them working. His intellect apperceives what his senses bring to him, his emotions show how he personally feels about it, and his will indicates what he intends to do about it. Thus the "mindedness" of man, as it develops and is changed, is superinduced by those things that, in the last analysis, come to him from without through his senses.

However, there is another contributing factor. For if the "mind," or the mental attitude of man, depended solely upon what comes to him through his senses, then all men having the same sense impressions would be of one mind, which is not the case. Why, then, do men react differently to what they experience? — In the first place, this is due to the fact that the mental powers are not equally alert and responsive in all men; the intelligence quotient is not the same; the entire mind works more slowly in some than in others; before one experience has run its course, another impinges upon them. The various degrees of mental alertness or mental sluggishness account in a measure for the different reaction of men to the same stimuli. — In the second place, this is due to the previous state of mind. The new is always interpreted in terms of the old. Established ideas and attitudes will strongly affect the reception of, and reaction to, new ideas and experiences. Pour the same ingredients into a glass of water and a glass of oil, and the reaction will be different because of the different content in the glasses. — In the third place, this is due to inherited predispositions, which may be a temperamental bias or an inborn inclination or a natural gift. Whatever it may be, this also accounts for a different reaction to external stimuli. For no sooner does the mind work on the material brought in by the senses than these native traits quietly exert their influence and thus help to shape the ultimate result. Like the psychic powers themselves, mental alertness or sluggishness, established ideas and attitudes, and inherited predisposition are quiescent until something new enters the mind, when at once they exert their influence. But since in all these things, as also in others, there is a great difference among men — there are hardly two people in the world that are physically and

mentally alike—we can understand why they do not react alike to the same ideas and experiences.

While we make due allowances for this, we still maintain that every change of mind is brought on by some new thought or idea that enters our consciousness, even as the composition of a mixture is changed by adding some new ingredient. Thus on the basis of new sense perception the intellect acquires new knowledge, on the basis of this new or changed knowledge the heart feels, and on the basis of such thought-controlled emotions the will acts. Let evil thoughts enter the mind, and, if they take effect, they will corrupt the heart and mislead the will. Teach man to think good and noble thoughts, and you will change his attitude and life for the better. "For as he thinketh in his heart, so is he," Prov. 23:7. If, then, there is to be a *μετάνοια*, there must first be a change in the things that engage the attention.

How do new thoughts and ideas bring about a change of mind?—In any change there is a *terminus a quo* and a *terminus ad quem*, a point from which it starts and a point to which it leads. Before the change of mind takes place, there is in man a certain *Gesinnung*, a mindedness, which consists in his attitude toward what he knows, and which directs his volition and, hence, also his conduct.

As new ideas, then, enter the mind, they modify and perhaps radically change the view and opinion held before. Because of the new information received man thinks differently about a certain matter, and because he thinks differently, he also feels differently. This change in feeling and sentiment is the cardinal point in any *μετάνοια*, for it is not what a man knows, but how he feels about what he knows that determines his real attitude, *animus*, *Gesinnung*. This feeling at once changes also the direction of the will. Thus the idea arouses an emotion, and this initiates volition. Yet such acts of volition do not simply run wild in any unpredictable direction, but the idea which controls our attention determines not only the type of emotion the heart experiences, but also the direction of the will. "To say that an emotion or a feeling or sentiment may determine a voluntary act, is only to say that a certain form of perception or idea may do so." Angell, *Psychology*. Moreover, there is a delicate interplay between the things that occupy our mind. One thought and its resultant emotion modifies, checks, or furthers the other, so that the ultimate attitude is the composite result of various ideational elements. But whatever change of mind may take place, in the last analysis it is due to something new that has entered the mind and holds the interest and attention. We all have frequently experienced a change of mind, and as we analyze the mental processes involved, we find it happened just this way:

thought material, either newly learned or remembered, occupied our attention, and as we meditated thereon, there followed a change of heart and will.

Yet, not every thought that enters the mind will automatically bring about also a change of mind. This "is due simply and solely to the inhibiting effect of some other sensational or ideational process which is also struggling for motor expression," Angell. This statement is borne out by our own experience and by our observation in others. There were other ideas and thoughts in our mind, which for some reason or other were more important to us, and as long as they held our interest and dominated our consciousness, the new idea was repressed and sidetracked and could not exert its influence. But as we continued to meditate upon the new matter we had heard, it not only became clearer to us, but also its motor power increased until it finally became strong enough to exert itself against the inhibiting effect of other considerations. Thoughts that engage our attention to the exclusion of others will impress the heart and turn the will. If, then, we can get people to give us their undivided attention, to see things our way, and to forget everything else, we are likely to bring about a change of mind in them.

Important as this observation may be in our dealing with men, it does not fully explain why a certain thought or truth, forcibly presented to a group of men, should result in a change of mind with some and not with others. Here we encounter an intangible something in the nature of man; it may be an established attitude, it may be a temperamental trait, it may be a native predisposition, or something else, over which we have no direct control, that accounts for the difference in interest men display, and that also affects their mental activities and movements.

It must be evident that a genuine μετάνοια, even in worldly and everyday affairs, is by no means a superficial matter, but it engages the entire soul life of man. Beginning with a change in knowledge, it changes the emotional attitude of the heart, turns the will, and is reflected in our actions. To understand the mental processes involved and the possible hindrances we may encounter, will help us to plan our approach and procedure in trying to bring about a change of mind.

III

The Spiritual Metanoia. — *Its Essence.* — As used in the New Testament, the term μετάνοια is not broadly used of any change of mind in the common affairs of life, but is restricted to a change of mind with respect to moral and spiritual things, a change of mind with respect to God. Its *terminus a quo* and *terminus ad quem* are definitely fixed. It is not merely a change in the intel-

lectual knowledge and understanding of God's Word, but rather a change in the heart's attitude and relation to God; it is a change from enmity against God to faith in, and love of, God, followed by a change from love of sin to sorrow over sin.

That we might better understand wherein this μετάνοια consists, it may be profitable to examine what has just been mentioned, that is, *from* what and *to* what the mind changes, in other words, the *terminus a quo* and the *terminus ad quem* of this change.

The terminus a quo. — The point from which this μετάνοια starts is the attitude of natural man toward God. Before the Fall the heart of man revered, loved, and trusted in God. But when the suggestions of the Serpent took effect, there was a change for the worse: his heart departed from the Lord, and he ate of the forbidden fruit, the outward act being a result of the inward change. Man had ceased to fear and love and trust in God. He now selfishly desired benefits for himself which, he thought, God had denied him, Gen. 3:5, 6. When called to an account, he tried to shield himself by lying to God, v. 10, and by blaming the woman, v. 12. It was no longer love of God, but love of self that dominated him and dictated his actions. And this selfishness was not a momentary whim and weakness, soon again cast off, but it became a permanent attitude. That drop of poison had so thoroughly corrupted his entire nature that it continued to work in him and was passed on to his children, who were begotten "in his own likeness," Gen. 3:3. Ever since then man is controlled by stark selfishness, seeking his own advantage and serving his own interests. While he still knows that there is a God, Rom. 1:19, 20, from whom he receives many blessings in life, Acts 14:17, he is not disposed to love Him, but he is afraid of Him, and whatever service he renders is dictated by fear of punishment or expectation of reward. This selfishness of man is reflected also in his dealings with his neighbor; Adam did not hesitate to blame his wife, and Cain killed his brother Abel. So men, as they are by nature, do to this day seek their own advantage, glory, and safety, even though thereby they destroy and ruin their neighbor. Departing in his heart from the God that made him, man has become his own god; he loves himself, lives to himself, and serves himself. The dominant power in the lives of individuals and of nations is pure and unadulterated selfishness.

This egocentric attitude of man the Bible describes with but one word, "flesh." Because man is "flesh," he is constantly at variance with the Spirit of God, Gen. 6:3. The flesh lusteth against the Spirit, Gal. 5:17. The carnal mind does not seek to please God, but is set on the things of the flesh, Rom. 8:5, things which God abhors and forbids, Gal. 5:19-21. And all this is not an attitude

which man gradually develops as he grows older, but "the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth," Gen. 8:21; he is flesh because he is born of flesh, John 3:6. Thus man is by nature carnally minded and sold under sin, Rom. 7:14. There is in him no innate latent predisposition toward God, which, like a germ in the seed, would under favorable conditions sprout and turn the heart and will toward God; no, man is by nature opposed to God and inclined to evil. While fallen man still has a mind, that is, those psychic powers wherewith God equipped him, there is absolutely nothing in his mind and make-up that could possibly induce him to change his attitude toward God.

This description of the natural state of man does by no means flatter his vanity, and he will deny that it applies to him. Yet that is the portrait the Bible paints of him, and an honest and searching self-examination will convince us that the Bible does not overstate the case. For works of the flesh are not only those vile and black vices we abhor in sinners and publicans, but also the bright and glamorous virtues of the self-righteous Pharisees. The selfishness of man manifests itself not only in his love for sin and pleasure, but also in his efforts to build up for himself a righteousness before God and man, Luke 18:11, 12.

This is the natural state of man from which the *μετάνοια* must start; this carnal mind must be changed.

Terminus ad quem primus.—In a number of Bible texts the words *μετάνοια* and *μετανοεῖν* refer to a change of mind with respect to sin, without necessarily including that the mind is also turned toward God and His grace. Thus in Heb. 6:1 we read "of repentance, *μετάνοια*, from dead works and of faith towards God." The change of mind toward God is indicated by the word "faith," and the term *μετάνοια* refers only to a difference in attitude toward "dead works," sins. In a similar way Christ differentiates between *μετανοεῖτε* and *πιστεύετε*, Mark 1:15. In each of these cases there has taken place a change of mind with respect to the sins mentioned. Now, what may this change be? The previous position of man was that he was inclined toward sin and found pleasure therein. And though he may have heard that such things are forbidden and will bring him misery and woe, he did not take it to heart. But when he begins to realize what the consequences of his sin may be, or perhaps already experiences them in his life, and fears further punishments, a change of mind is likely to occur. He now sees the other side of sin; it is no longer beautiful and tempting, bright and innocent, but ugly and hideous, black and frightening. While before there was joy and pleasure in its service, there is now heartache and sorrow and despair for having lived in sin. Think of Judas. Evidently a real change

of mind has taken place, but it is a change merely with respect to sin. Before this, man lightheartedly indulged in its service; now he is ashamed and sorry and terrified for having done so. It is a change from delight in sin to sorrow over sin. This is the first meaning of *repent* and *repentance*. (We know, of course, that, though there is sorrow over one particular sin on account of its results, the love of sin remains till faith is created.)

Terminus ad quem secundus.—The term μετάνοια is also used in a wider sense, which includes what has been said above, but reaches farther, the *terminus ad quem* being faith in the forgiving grace of God. Paul speaks of a repentance toward God, Acts 20:21, and of a repentance unto life, Acts 11:18, and tells us that a godly sorrow worketh a μετάνοια to salvation, 2 Cor. 7:10. We might also quote the words of Christ, Luke 24:47: μετάνοιαν εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, repentance unto the forgiveness of sins (there are variant readings of this text, \aleph and B have εἰς, unto, while A, B, D have καί, and). In these texts the term μετάνοια evidently has a wider reach; it does not stop at sorrow over sin, but it includes faith in the forgiveness of sins, love of God, and hope of eternal life.

Before this, man was sorry, deeply sorry, for his sin, because he feared or suffered its consequences. Yet he did not dare to look to God for help in his trouble, his heart was rather filled with hatred against Him whose judgment he feared. But now he learns something new about God, something he has never heard before. He is told that "God so loved the world that He gave His only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish but have everlasting life," John 3:16. Of all this, natural man knows nothing, nor can he learn of it from books of human wisdom, nor is it possible for any man to arrive at such a conclusion by rationalizing on facts known to him. This thing has never entered the heart of man; it is a mystery, hid in the heart of God, but revealed to us by the Spirit in the Gospel, 1 Cor. 2:6-10. In the Gospel, God opens His heart to us, reveals His love, and offers grace and forgiveness to lost sinners. Now, all this is so strange, so foreign, to the thinking of man that at first it seems unbelievable and foolish to him. Yet his doubts do not disprove the fact of this truth; it is plainly stated in many texts of the Bible. As this new knowledge enters the mind of man, his ideas of God are changed; and as it touches his heart, his attitude toward God is radically changed. For as the darkness of night vanishes before the rising sun, so gloom and despair, fear and hatred, are dispelled when the radiant light of this heavenly truth illumines the heart, filling it with faith and love, with joy and hope. The heart has now completely turned to God. This is the spiritual μετάνοια in its fullest sense.

"The term 'repentance' is not employed in the Holy Scriptures in one and the same sense. For in some passages of Holy Scriptures it is employed and taken for the entire conversion of man, as Luke 13:5: 'Except ye repent, ye shall likewise perish.' And in chap. 15:7: 'Likewise joy shall be in heaven over one sinner that repenteth.' But in this passage, Mark 1:15, as also elsewhere, where repentance and faith in Christ, Acts 20:21, or repentance and remission of sins, Luke 24:46, 47, are mentioned as distinct, to repent means nothing else than truly to acknowledge sins, to be heartily sorry for them, and to desist from them." *Trigl.*, p. 958.

And the Augsburg Confession, Art. XIII, describes repentance in its wider sense as consisting of two parts: "One is contrition, that is, terrors smiting the conscience through the knowledge of sin; the other is faith, which is born of the Gospel, or of absolution, and believes that for Christ's sake sins are forgiven, comforts the conscience, and delivers it from terrors." *Trigl.*, p. 49.

Taking the term μετάνοια in its wider sense, it denotes that change of mind which we commonly call conversion or regeneration. But as this μετάνοια consists of two parts, we inquire: At which point does conversion take place? Is it a process extending over a shorter or longer period of time? Is a person converted halfway when he experiences contrition over his sins, and fully converted when faith in Christ is added? Answering the second question first, let us say that a person, deeply distressed because of his sins, is not converted, not even in part. There is indeed a change of mind with respect to his sins, but none with respect to God. Thinking of God, his heart is still full of fear, despair, and hatred. Sorrow over sin is a necessary prerequisite of conversion, but, by itself, it is not conversion. The μετάνοια which is identical with conversion is the change of mind with respect to God and consists in this, that because of the promise of grace and forgiveness the heart turns to God in confidence and faith. And such change from despair to faith is not a gradual process, but an instantaneous act. For the very moment that the faintest longing for this grace and forgiveness springs up in the heart, a change, a real change, takes place in the mind of man, and this change we call conversion. Waves of fear and despair may still surge through the heart; yet there is that undertow of confidence in the grace of God.

When, therefore, in the following paragraphs we shall speak of mental processes in connection with this μετάνοια, we do not mean that the change of mind itself is an extended process, but we refer to those mental experiences that precede this change and finally culminate in this change. For the μετάνοια takes place in the mind and engages the mental faculties; but whenever the change comes, it comes instantaneously.

How is this "μετάνοια" brought about? — In a number of Bible texts men are asked and commanded to repent, to change their mind, Matt. 3:2; Acts 17:30, and we also learn that men have repented, Matt. 12:41. Because of such and similar statements some maintain that it is within the power of man to effect such a change. This, however, is impossible. We say a ship turns, and so it does. Yet it cannot do so of itself; there is some other power that changes the course of the ship. It is even so here. Conversion is essentially a change of mind, the mind turns from despair in sin to faith in the Savior. In this change all the mental faculties of man are engaged and active, yet they do not produce it, they merely experience it. We have pointed out above that by nature man is carnal-minded and inclined to evil. Conscious of his guilt, he fears and hates God. Hence, there is in him no innate predisposition toward God. And as the saving grace of God is by nature absolutely unknown to him, 1 Cor. 2:9, there is nothing in his natural experience that could possibly incline his heart toward God. Man, then, as he is naturally constituted, does not and cannot initiate and bring about a change of his mind with respect to God. A heart that is inclined to sin can, of itself, never change to a heart that abhors sin, and a heart that fears and hates God can, of itself, never change to a heart that loves and trusts in God. Some new element of knowledge must enter the mind and hold the attention of man, new thoughts and truths must exert their influence on his heart, if a μετάνοια is to result. Thus man turns because he is being turned, Jer. 31:18; he changes his mind because of some influence from without that produces this change.

External Means. — In order to bring about a μετάνοια in man, there must needs be, in the first place, an outside influence and power that works on his mind. And what is this power? It is the power of God as it operates through the Law and the Gospel.

It is true that by nature man has some knowledge of God's Law and that his conscience convicts him of his transgressions and holds him responsible to God, Rom. 2:14, 15; 1:32. What this knowledge of the Law and conscience do but imperfectly and feebly, being often overshadowed and suppressed by the carnal appetites of man, the revealed Law stresses and deepens. "It was added because of transgression," says Paul, Gal. 3:19. Its chief purpose was not to put an end to transgressions, but rather to bring them to the knowledge of man. It entered that the offense might abound, Rom. 5:20, that the innate sinfulness of man, taking occasion by the commandment and working all manner of concupiscence, Rom. 7:8, should be brought into the open, to the consciousness of man. Thus "by the Law is the knowledge of sin," Rom. 3:20; 7:7. Before a person can experience a change of mind with respect to his com-

placent self-righteousness, he must learn to know how corrupt and sinful he is both by nature and by his own deeds. "They that be whole need not a physician, but they that are sick," Matt. 9:12. From the Law, men must learn to know their spiritual ailment.

Hence, we must teach the Law clearly and apply it to our hearers. In a general, and often very superficial, way almost everybody will admit that he is a sinner; but he is not so ready to plead guilty of specific sins. Therefore in teaching the Law let us not talk about the sins of the heathen in darkest Africa or inveigh against the wickedness of the children of the world, but let us rather speak of those temptations that beset our hearers, and point out those sins of which we, of which they, may be guilty. Witness the preaching of John the Baptist, Matt. 3:7. — Yet in order that no one may pass lightly over these things, we must furthermore call attention to the consequences of sin. "The wages of sin is death," Rom. 6:23; Deut. 27:26. Men must realize that sin, even the smallest sin, is a grievous offense against the holy and almighty God, who has no pleasure in wickedness and hates the workers of iniquity, Ps. 5:4, 5. We are so apt to lose the sense and feeling for the heinousness of our own sins and to regard them as mere trifles, as weaknesses or failings, nothing to worry about. Yet in the same ratio in which we fail to realize the dire consequences of our transgressions, we shall fail to be truly sorry of them. If, then, there is to be contrition of heart, there must first be a clear knowledge of one's sins and a live sense of the curse they merit. — It is in vain to tell a man again and again that he must repent if he does not know of what and why he should repent. It is not even necessary to mention the word repentance to him, for if we convince him of his wrongdoing and he realizes what this will mean for him, contrition will follow as a matter of course. And the Law of God is the very means that will accomplish this. Let us, therefore, not merely demand repentance, but *let us rather so preach the Law that repentance results.* — Thus it is that by the preaching of the Law new ideas and thoughts concerning sin are put into the mind of man; and as these impress the heart, there will be "contrition, that is, terrors smiting the conscience through the knowledge of sin," which, according to our Confession, is the first part of repentance.

"The other [part] is faith, which is born of the Gospel, or of absolution, and believes that for Christ's sake sins are forgiven, comforts the conscience, and delivers it from terrors." The Gospel is not another law, making new demands on man, and it must not be preached as though its promises depended on something man must do; but it is the proclamation of God's free grace and pardon to a sin-cursed world, the unconditional promise of forgiveness

of sins to the lost sons of man. It tells us that God loved the world, John 3:16, that Christ came to save sinners, 1 Tim. 1:15, that He atoned for the sins of all men, 1 John 2:2, and reconciled the world unto God, 2 Cor. 5:19. All this is revealed in the Gospel not as a possibility which becomes actual only if we do our part, but it is revealed as an accomplished fact, and full salvation is offered to all without money and without price. Lovingly the Father calls the lost and oppressed: "Return unto Me, for I have redeemed thee," Is. 44:22, and earnestly the Savior invites: "Come, for all things are now ready," Luke 14:17.

Now, all this is something new, unheard of, almost unbelievable, and yet most certainly true. As these blessed truths enter the mind of man, his ideas of God certainly change; and as these ideas touch his heart, his attitude toward God changes, he feels different toward God than he did before, fear and hatred melt away, and there springs up a longing for that promised grace and forgiveness, which under the repeated assurances of the Gospel grows into a joyous confident faith. Also here let us bear in mind that, in dealing with our people, we do not merely ask them to believe in God; but let us tell them what to believe about Him; let us assure them that, while He hates sin, He loves the sinner and would have him saved; let us make clear to them the meaning of Christ's redemption, and apply to them personally the promises of God's grace and forgiveness. *Let us so preach the Gospel that faith results.* For that is the purpose of all our teaching and preaching that the hearts of men turn to God in faith, that there be a μετάνοια εἰς ἀφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, Luke 24:47.

The Law and the Gospel are the means to bring about a change of mind in man; however, they are not dead instruments. Because they are the Word of God, the power of God operates through both of them. Therefore says Christ: "The words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life," John 6:63. And Heb. 4:12 we read: "The Word of God is quick and powerful." This power to touch and turn the heart is not a natural one, such as inheres also in words spoken by men; but since it is God's Word, and since the Holy Ghost is inseparably connected therewith, there is inherent in this Word at all times and under all conditions a supernatural power and divine efficacy.

Internal means and method.—As the conversion of man takes place in the soul, the powers or functions with which God has equipped the soul are engaged and set into motion by the Word of God. The Word of God does not work in a magical way, so that a mere external contact therewith is able to produce a true μετάνοια in man. Such superstitious ideas do not lie dead and buried in the Dark Ages of the past, but we find a type of them in those people

who believe that, because they are externally affiliated with a church and have physically exposed themselves to a few sermons, they are fairly good Christians. As God revealed His Law and His Gospel in terms intelligible to human beings, it follows that He would deal with man as with a rational creature, which, having intellectual, emotional, and volitional abilities, can be taught in his mind, touched in his heart, and turned in his will. "Er ist kein Stein oder Block, insofern der Mensch auch nach dem Fall noch eine vernuenftige Kreatur ist, die Verstand und Willen hat und in seinem Verstand und Willen Gottes Wirkung erfahret." Pieper, *Christliche Dogmatik*, Vol. II, p. 548. In bringing about a change of mind in man, God does not simply ignore and pass by these psychic abilities, with which He Himself has endowed man, but He makes use of them. He teaches man to know the Law and the Gospel; by this knowledge He impresses and moves the heart and turns the will. While, therefore, the Law and the Gospel may be regarded as the external means through which God works on man from without, these mental faculties are the internal means He employs within. To make this point clear, we might think of the fact that God in nourishing our bodies uses food as the external means, but he also employs the functions of the various alimentary organs of our bodies in order that the food may accomplish its purpose. In a similar manner God works on man from without through His Law and His Gospel, but within man He employs the functions of his soul to bring about a change of mind.

Food will not nourish us unless it is eaten and assimilated; even so the Word of God remains powerless and ineffective if it is not learned. The Word of God we have in our Bibles will never bring about a change of mind unless it first enters the mind. Without a knowledge of the Law a person would know neither his sin, Rom. 7:7, nor the wrath of God because of this sin. And whoever does not know the Gospel can thereby never be made wise unto salvation through faith in Christ Jesus, 2 Tim. 3:15; Rom. 10:14. Thus God makes use of the intellectual ability of the soul, by means of which we acquire knowledge of His Word.

But also the emotional function of the soul is called into service. For if this new knowledge holds the attention of man, if there is real attention, if he seriously thinks and meditates on what he has learned, and understands what it means to him personally, then it is likely that this knowledge will impress and move the heart, creating therein *motus novos*, new feelings. Thus the heart of Lydia was opened because she heard Paul preach, Acts 16:14. The type of this emotional response depends upon the content of the new thought that entered the mind. Thus the con-

tent of the Law is quite different from that of the Gospel; hence also the effect of the Law on the heart differs from that of the Gospel. The heart's response to the Law is remorse and sorrow over sin, terrors of conscience and despair; but the heart's response to the glad tidings of the Gospel is faith and love, joy and hope, a new life of spiritual power.

Thus we see, in bringing about a μετάνοια in man God deals with him as with a rational creature. He makes use of his mental equipment, his intellectual, emotional, and volitional powers, and follows the ordinary psychic procedure and method, namely, He teaches man to know His Word, by this knowledge He opens his heart, and through all this He turns his will. As far, then, as the purely psychic processes in the spiritual μετάνοια are concerned, they are the same as the psychic processes in any other change of mind man may experience.

However, we would note some differences between the common and the spiritual μετάνοια. — The material which produces in man a change of mind with respect to the ordinary affairs of life is diversified and distributed over a wide range of human interests and experiences. But the ideas and thoughts that bring about the spiritual μετάνοια are limited to those things which man learns from the Law and the Gospel, and pertain to his relation to his God. And this μετάνοια, which covers a narrow and specific field, consists, as has been pointed out, in a change of heart from love of sin to sorrow over sin, and from fear and hatred of God to love and trust in God.

Furthermore, while God, indeed, uses the Law and the Gospel, through which He works on man from without, and the mental capabilities of the soul, on which He works within man, it is He that gives knowledge and understanding, 2 Cor. 4:6; it is He who through such knowledge moves and opens the heart, Acts 16:14; it is He who turns the will, Jer. 31:18; Phil. 2:13. Hence we read Rom. 2:4: "that the goodness of God leadeth thee to repentance," and Acts 11:18: "Then hath God also to the Gentiles granted repentance unto life." Whenever a μετάνοια results, then it is not an achievement of man but a work and a gift of God, it is due not to human powers but to the monergism of God's grace.

In this connection we would call attention also to 1 Cor. 2:14: "Natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him; neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." Paul certainly does not mean to say that natural man lacks the organic, constitutional capacity for learning and knowing the truths which God has revealed to us by His Spirit; for if anyone regards them as foolishness, he must have acquired at least an intellectual knowledge of them. But

while his mind may know them, his heart does not receive them, and no μετάνοια results. Then Paul adds: "Neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." The knowledge here denied to natural man is not an intellectual cognition (*Verstandeserkenntnis*), but rather an inward realization and appreciation of what the things of the Spirit mean to him personally (*Herzenerkenntnis*). The reason: "because they are spiritually discerned." What does this mean?

"Discerned" hardly conveys the concept of the Greek ἀνακρίνεται (*anakrinetai*), which, being a juridic term, means to examine and question closely with a view of arriving at a judgment. Luther, therefore, translated "denn es muss geistlich gerichtet sein." For the meaning of the word see 1 Cor. 9:3; 10:25, 27; 4:3, 4; 2:15. We may here call attention to the distinction between *Verstand* and *Vernunft*, understanding, or intellect, and reason. Our intellect concerns itself with the things that come to us from without through our senses; it grasps and understands them. As a result there is an intellectual knowledge. However, "nicht alles, was wir verstehen, ist uns auch vernuenftig," not all we have learned to know seems also rational to us. For as soon as the intellect (*Verstand*) has grasped a thing, reason (*Vernunft*) sets in to judge and evaluate what we have learned. This presupposes something according to which reason judges or evaluates the new matter. This something may be past experiences, established views, recognized laws and principles, or personal interests. Ordinarily man does not accept anything without thoroughly scrutinizing and judging it. And this is the function of reason (*Vernunft*) as distinguished from understanding (*Verstand*). When natural man has learned to know the things of the Spirit, has acquired a *Verstandeserkenntnis*, his reason will at once examine and judge them, and it can do this only in the light of such knowledge and views as man has held before. But as the things of the Spirit have "never entered the heart of man," 1 Cor. 2:9, and are therefore entirely new to him, there is nothing in his past experience by which he can properly evaluate and judge them. In fact, they seem so contrary to his former way of thinking that he regards them as foolishness. For this reason Paul adds "for they must be probed and judged *spiritually*."

By the use of the adjective ψυχικός (natural, in our version) and the adverb πνευματικῶς (spiritual) Paul in our text contrasts the ψυχή (soul) and the πνεῦμα (spirit) of man. Now, these are not two different elements in man, but rather the two sides of the one immaterial nature which stands in contrast to the material body. The soul is the active life principle in man, which manifests itself in his rational, emotional, and volitional activities, and views

the individual chiefly in relation and reaction to earthly environments and experiences. The spirit is the same essence as the soul, but viewed in its relation to God and divine things. When, therefore, we say that by nature man is spiritually dead, we do not mean to say that his rational soul has ceased to function with respect to those things with which he comes into contact; but we mean that its contact with, and relation to, God has been completely cut off. In relation to earthly things the soul of the ψυχικός ἄνθρωπος, natural man, is very much alive; but with respect to God and divine things it is dead. The spirit of man, then, is the soul of man viewed in its relation to God. While this distinction is not strictly observed throughout, it will help us in the understanding of our text. The things of the Spirit must be examined and probed, not ψυχικῶς, in man's relation to earthly things, but πνευματικῶς, in his relation to God, and that is possible only after man is born again by the power of the Gospel.

In the first place, it must be remembered that the truths of the Bible are not of this earth, 1 Cor. 2:6, 7, and may therefore not be measured and judged by standards of human wisdom and reasoning. But being revealed by the Spirit of God, v. 10, they are divine truths, are in a class by themselves, and must therefore be examined and judged objectively on the basis of their essence and merit. For this reason Paul tells us that we must bring every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ, 2 Cor. 10:5.

Next, we must understand that these things of the Spirit do not pertain to our earthly relations, to our psychic connection with, and reaction to, earthly things, but they pertain to our spirit, our relation to God. The purpose of the things of the Spirit is to assure to penitent sinners grace and forgiveness from God, and to create in their hearts faith and love and hope in God, in short, to re-establish that spiritual relation with God that was disrupted by man's sin. It is from this point of view that we must examine and judge the things of the Spirit and ask ourselves whether they really satisfy the spiritual needs of man. The teachings of the Bible will be foolishness to him who does not understand their spiritual purpose.

Natural man, whose imagination is evil from his youth, does not appreciate the spiritual purpose of the "things of the Spirit," and therefore he cannot and does not receive them into his heart. It is not he that opens his heart to them, but it is rather they that touch and open his heart. As natural man hears and learns the truths of God's Word, it is the Holy Spirit that illumines his mind to understand their spiritual purpose, it is He that impresses and opens the heart and turns the will, so that the very things that were foolishness to man before are now precious, saving wisdom. Thus

God makes use of the psychic functions of man to effect in him a spiritual μετάνοια.

In this connection we may ask about the μετάνοια of our baptized infants.

We read Mark 1:4: "John did baptize in the wilderness and preach the Baptism of repentance unto the remission of sins." The μετάνοια εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν was the characteristic of this Baptism; it involved the obligation of a change of mind from sin to the remission of sin. Referring to the Baptism of John, Christ says: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God," John 3:5. Even as the Baptism of John, so the Baptism which Christ instituted was a means of regeneration, for by it men are "made disciples" of Christ, Matt. 28:19, and Paul calls it "the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost," Titus 3:5. Thus the promises of Baptism not only offer spiritual blessings, but the Holy Ghost, operating through these promises connected with the water, regenerates, and renews the heart, brings about μετάνοιαν εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, works faith in the forgiveness of sins.

And this is the effect Baptism has also on our infant children. However, it is impossible to trace the psychic processes normally involved in a change of mind. To us it seems that the infant is altogether unconscious of what is going on. Perhaps he is sleeping or crying during the entire sacramental action and does not understand the meaning and purpose and benefit of Baptism. His mental powers are not yet active. How, then, can there be a change of mind? Paul tells us that faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God, Rom. 10:17. But how can the infant hear and know the Word of God so that faith may result in his heart? These questions we cannot answer. With grown persons faith is a conscious experience, 2 Tim. 1:12, and we can understand the mental processes involved in its creation, but it is utterly futile to attempt to analyze them in infants.

Nevertheless, on the authority of God's Word we believe that also in our baptized infants a real μετάνοια takes place, that they experience a new, a spiritual, birth, John 3:5, that in Baptism they become God's children through faith in Christ Jesus, and put on the merits of their Savior, Gal. 3:26, 27.

Why Different Results. — In the preceding paragraphs we have endeavored to show by what means and in what manner God works in man a μετάνοια from sin to the Savior. However, there remains another question to be answered. Why do not all that hear the Law and the Gospel repent and believe? Why do not all experience a μετάνοια? Christ answers this question Matt. 23:37. He had labored long and earnestly to win the children of Jerusalem

over to Himself. "How often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and *ye would not!*" and Stephen tells the Jews: "Ye stiffnecked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do *always resist the Holy Ghost*; as your fathers did, so do ye," Acts 7:51. On the part of God everything was done to draw these people to Himself, but on the part of man there was a contrary will and resistance.

But what is this perverse will of man that resists the efforts of the Holy Ghost? Viewed as the volitional function of the soul, the will is a precious gift of God, and though weakened by the Fall, it is in itself not a wicked, sinful thing. When God works in us to will of His good pleasure, Phil. 2:13, He employs the same faculty of willing that is active when people will not come to Christ. The perverseness lies not in the will itself, but in the direction in which this will tends. Whether we will what is evil or will what is good, it always is the same will viewed as a psychic function, but the difference lies in the object towards which this willing is directed.

Hence we ask, what determines the direction of our volition? What lies behind the unwillingness and resistance of natural man when Christ calls him and the Holy Spirit works on him? Why did the Jews not yield to the pleadings of Jesus? Why did they resist the Holy Ghost? Why did the divine truths they had learned from the Law and the Gospel not bring about a μετάνοια? Not every thought and idea that enters the mind produces also a change of mind. And the fault lies not in the thought itself, but rather in this, that some other thought or idea has a stronger hold on the attention and interest of man, and thus prevents the former from taking effect. For whatever interests dominate the consciousness of man, determine, for the time being, his attitude and actions. If, then, the Jews "would not" come to Christ and "resisted the Holy Ghost," there evidently was something that motivated their behavior and caused them to act as they did.

Now, what is this something? As we observe the different reaction of men to the same type of stimuli and experiences, we ask, Why should this be? It is said that this is due to previous instruction and training. We admit that previous instruction and training and the convictions and attitudes resulting therefrom strongly affect one's reaction to new ideas and experiences. Whoever has been taught and is convinced that he is just and perfect, is not ready to repent and seek a Savior. Thus, when the Pharisees and lawyers rejected the counsel of God against themselves by not being baptized of John, Luke 7:30, they did so because they trusted in themselves that they were righteous, Luke 18:9, and for the same reason they spurned the services of the Physician

Jesus Christ, Matt. 9:11-13; John 7:48. Again, it may be philosophic pride that others "would not" come to Christ, 1 Cor. 1:26; to men who are wise in their own conceit the Gospel of Christ is indeed foolishness. Still others love the world, 1 John 2:15; 2 Tim. 4:10; it may be this or that phase of worldliness which has so captivated them that they "would not" change their mind. Thus there may be various things that are the *immediate* cause of man's resistance to the Holy Ghost and of his refusal to come to Christ.

However, this does not explain everything. For, as a matter of fact, self-righteous Pharisees, conceited philosophers, and profligate sinners have experienced a change of mind and come to Christ. While at first their self-righteousness, their great learning, their love of sin, may have prompted them to resist the influence of the Spirit of God operating through the Word, they finally yielded. Why should Nicodemus accept Christ and Caiaphas reject Him? Why did the one malefactor turn in faith to Christ, and the other did not? This is due, some aver, to a difference in men. Man comes into the world, so to speak, with a bias, by nature favoring certain experiences in preference to other possible ones. And men differ from one another as regards the special direction of this bias. Call this bias what you will, temperamental or character traits, or natural gifts or weaknesses; at all events, they exert an influence on the whole range of man's mental activity and explain, in a measure, why individuals react differently under like conditions.

While psychology may thus try to explain why men respond differently to the same stimuli in ordinary human affairs, this does not explain the different reaction of men to spiritual things. Indeed, also with regard to spiritual matters man enters this world with a definite bias, but there is *no* difference in men as to the direction of this bias; it is altogether negative. "For the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth," Gen. 8:21, and because of this inborn sinfulness he is dead to all spiritual things, Eph. 2:1. And as there are no degrees in this state of spiritual death, there is in no man a predisposition favorable to a μετάνοια toward God; on the contrary, "the carnal mind is enmity against God," Rom. 8:7. Whenever, therefore, in a given case a person will not come to Christ, the *immediate* cause may be his love of sin or his intellectual conceit or his self-righteousness, but the *ultimate* cause is his selfish, sinful, corrupt nature. Man is flesh, hence he minds the things of the flesh, Rom. 8:5; they not only attract him, but he is himself strongly inclined toward them.

We may grant the force of previous training and of a natural bias in so far as the innate sinfulness, as the ultimate cause, manifests itself in one person in his love for this or another sin, in another

in his self-righteousness, in a third in his pride of wisdom, as the immediate causes of their resistance to the Holy Ghost. But the basic attitude of man toward God and His efforts to bring about a μετάνοια is alike in all men. Thus behind the "ye would not" and the "ye do always resist" lies in every case the corrupt nature of man, in which are rooted, and from which proceed, all those forces that oppose the influence of God's Word on the heart of man. As these inhibitions, which prevent the Word from taking effect, exist or *originate in man*, in the individual's own nature, it is he, and he alone, that is responsible if no μετάνοια results. "Thou hast destroyed thyself," Hos. 13:9.

If, on the other hand, a μετάνοια toward God eventuates, then this can in no sense be due to anything in man. While he indeed experiences this change in his mind, his mind does not effect it; while he has some knowledge of God and of His Law, there is nothing in this knowledge that could possibly change the enmity of his heart to love and confidence in God; neither is there a submerged native predisposition which, coming to the surface, would initiate a change in his attitude toward God. Unless some influence from without is brought to bear on the mind of man, there never will be a change of mind. Whenever, therefore, a μετάνοια does take place, it is due exclusively to a power that *originates in God*, operates through the Word, and exerts its influence on the soul of man. Thus it is that man turns to God, but it is God who turns him, Jer. 31:18; man repents and changes his mind, but it is God who works the change, God grants him repentance unto life, Acts 11:18. All honor, credit, and glory is His. "In Me is thine help," Hos. 13:9.

However, this does not answer all questions. For if it is true that there is no difference in men, that all are dead in trespasses and sins, spiritually dead, and that, therefore, while indeed capable of experiencing a μετάνοια, yet are absolutely unable to bring it about or to co-operate in bringing it about, why, then, are some of these dead quickened unto a spiritual life, while others remain dead? Why should the Word of God, which is powerful and efficacious at all times, be effective only in certain cases? If by nature all men are equally incompetent to change their mind, and if the Holy Ghost, operating through the Word, is the only one who can bring about this change of mind in man, and is also willing to do so, why, then, the different result? *Cur alii prae aliis?* We reject the answers both of Synergism, which teaches that there is a difference in the attitude of men toward God, and of Calvinism, which teaches that there is a difference in the attitude of God toward men, because both conflict with the Word of God. And we ourselves have no answer to give, because the Word of God does not give any.

Synonyms.—Such *μετάνοια* is identical with conversion, enlightenment, regeneration, and spiritual resurrection. All these express figuratively what is more directly expressed in the word *μετάνοια*. Conversion denotes a turning: because of the new knowledge received the heart now turns from sin to the Savior, Jer. 31:18. Enlightenment tells us that because of this new knowledge, man now sees both his sins and his God in a different light; the gloom and terror has fled, and there is sunshine in the heart, 2 Cor. 4:6. Regeneration means that man is reborn unto a new life. As natural birth was the beginning of his physical life, so the *μετάνοια* is the beginning of a spiritual life, John 3:6; by the first birth we are the children of our natural parents, by the second we become the children of God, John 1:12, 13. The term resurrection, or quickening, indicates that before, man was spiritually dead, but is now raised unto a new spiritual life, Eph. 2:1-6. The word *μετάνοια* expresses more directly what actually takes place in the mind of man.

Results of this *metanoia*.—This change of mind has immediate and far-reaching results, affecting the present and the future life of man. The change consists in this, that the fear of threatened punishment gives way to faith in the forgiveness of sins, procured by the redemption of Christ and freely offered by God in the Gospel. The moment faith, even though it yet be a feeble longing, reaches out for, and lays hold of, this forgiveness, man has complete forgiveness, and stands justified before his God, Rom. 3:28. Being cleansed by the blood of Christ and covered with the garment of His righteousness, the sinner is now a saint in the eyes of God. Thus the change in the attitude of man's heart results immediately in changed relation between God and man.

In the second place, there is love and sanctification of life. Any change of mind results also in a change of life. This holds also with respect to the *μετάνοια* we have been discussing. Before there was in the heart of man love for sin and hatred of God, which was reflected in his ungodly life. Having experienced a change of heart, he now hates sin, which brought misery upon him, and loves God, who forgives sin. Also this change is reflected in his life, for "faith worketh by love," Gal. 5:6. Speaking of repentance as consisting of contrition and faith, the Aug. Conf., Art. XII, continues: "Then good works are bound to follow, which are the fruits of repentance."

In the third place, there is hope and glorification. Natural man has no valid hope for the future, Eph. 2:12; there remaineth for him only a certain fearful looking for of judgment, which fills his heart with despair. But no sooner has he experienced *μετάνοια* than there blossoms up in his soul a glorious hope, which sustains

him under the hardship of his earthly pilgrimage, and will be fully consummated in his glorification in heaven, 1 Pet. 1:3-9.

Practical suggestions. — A right understanding of this spiritual μετάνοια: what it is, by what means it is brought about, what are the mental processes involved, and what are its fruits, must be of practical importance to all who are called to preach this μετάνοια, Luke 24:47. We would call attention to but a few points.

1) As repentance consists of two parts, sorrow over sin and faith in Christ, and as these are wrought in the hearts of men through the Law and the Gospel, we must be careful to use none other than these means. It is utterly futile and foolish to substitute other measures and methods, and they who do, simply do not understand their business. Discussions on social, scientific, or political questions, the fireworks of grandiloquence and human wisdom, the display of ceremonial and ritual pomp, or whatever else bankrupt preachers may invent to draw crowds and please their hearers, will never produce a true μετάνοια toward God. Whether we preach to the inmates of asylums and penitentiaries, or to the elite of fashionable society, whether ours is a rural or an urban congregation, whether our hearers are rich or poor, unlearned or college-bred, there simply is no other means to bring about this godly change of mind in them than the Law and the Gospel. Both must be preached in the humble mission chapel and in the proud university cathedral.

2) But they must be preached in their proper order. We must rightly "divide the Word of Truth," 2 Tim. 2:15. A confusion and commingling of the Law and the Gospel will frustrate their purpose. No μετάνοια will result if we proclaim free forgiveness to those who willfully continue in their sins, and the curse of the Law to those who are of a broken and contrite spirit. In the first case there will be no sorrow and contrition of heart, in the second there will be no faith. Each must be taught in its place and for its specific purpose: the Law, that men might know their sins and realize their lost condition; the Gospel, that the penitent may learn to know of, and trust in, the grace of God in Christ Jesus.

3) Knowing that the Word of God can produce a change of mind in our hearers only when it gets into their mind, our aim must be to impart a clear understanding of the Bible truths. To this end we ourselves must be clear in our minds as to what we are going to teach and preach, and we must clearly express what we wish to impart. A rambling talk is of little value. Let us not assume that the intelligence of our hearers will put order and clarity into our confused presentation; on the contrary, it frequently happens that in spite of our clear exposition they misunderstand what we say and confuse themselves by injecting ir-

relevant matters into the picture. Clear and definite ideas have a greater force and a more directive power than a conglomeration of confused knowledge. Both the Law and the Gospel must be taught clearly if they are to be taught effectively.

4) However, our objective in teaching the Law and the Gospel is not merely to impart an intellectual knowledge of divine truths, but rather to effect through such knowledge a *μετάνοια*, a change of mind. Therefore we should not teach the Word of God in a cold and academic manner, without any intent of producing practical results, but we should explain the demands and the curse of the Law for the express purpose of bringing our hearers to a live knowledge of their sins and a deep realization of their lost condition. And we should proclaim the Gospel of grace, not for the intellectual entertainment of our congregations, but for the express purpose that troubled hearts may be comforted and drawn to God in faith and love. For our teaching is not an end in itself, and the knowledge of Bible truth is not an end in itself, but a means to an end, and this end is *μετάνοια*. Therefore we should not merely inform our people, but try to convince them, impress them, move them. While we instruct the mind, we must aim to touch the heart. When the Jews compared the teaching of the Scribes with that of Christ, they were astonished, not only at His doctrine, but also at the manner of His teaching, "for His word was with power," Luke 4:32, and He "taught as one having authority," Matt. 7:29. There was evident in His manner of teaching that deep sincerity and that interest in the eternal well-being of His hearers which also made a deep impression on their hearts. We know full well that we cannot add to the power of God's Word; yet there is an intangible something in the manner of our speaking that can hinder or support the efficacy of the Word. Let us, then, teach the truth of God's Word clearly and in all its purity; but let us also teach it as the truth, 1 Pet. 4:11; let us do this not as an *opus operatum*, but with the intent of turning the hearts of our hearers from love of sin to sorrow over sin, and from sorrow and contrition to faith in Christ, the Savior, that thus they might experience a true *μετάνοια* toward God.

River Forest, Ill.

E. W. A. KOEHLER



The Seminary and the Church

Paper read at the free conference of Lutheran seminary professors, held at Augustana Seminary, Rock Island, Ill., June 9—11, 1943

In beginning the consideration of the theme before our meeting this morning it is well for us to bear in mind that the seminary is not so necessary for the existence of the Church as we teachers at the various Lutheran seminaries are perhaps wont, or at least inclined, to assume. It may be conducive to humility on our part if we reflect that the Church existed and flourished once upon a time without such schools, and if that thought pricks some bubbles of self-importance which we may have fondly permitted to float about our heads, I would say we have made a good start in our discussion. The briefest kind of historical survey will suffice to show that the Church's life does not absolutely depend on her being provided with theological seminaries. I am here not thinking of the era of the Old Covenant, when there were vast stretches of time during which, at least as far as we know, the children of God did not have schools for the training of spiritual leaders, but of the early years of the New Testament. The Church, as we are all aware, came into existence without the aid of institutions of learning. It was quite a number of years after Pentecost that the first theological school was established.

Of course, there was teaching, teaching of theology, and teaching such as the world has never seen again. Our Lord Himself instructed a group of twelve men, some of them for about three years. "Lord, to whom shall we go?" they say, when to the right and to the left people showed disappointment and departed, and they were asked whether they, too, wished to leave Him. "Lord, to whom shall we go; for Thou hast the words of eternal life." We think likewise of the inspired teaching that was given by the Apostles to their pupils after Pentecost, when Paul attached men like Timothy, Titus, and Luke to himself, and Peter in a special way became the teacher of John Mark, and John the Evangelist the teacher of Polycarp. Much blessed, glorious instruction was given, we can be sure; far more than the isolated notices that have reached us record. But the Apostolic Age did not see the establishment of any theological schools, and hence it is clear that the Church can live and grow without them. This observation, of course, must not be interpreted as denying that such schools are a most desirable and helpful means for the development of the Church—a matter on which I shall have more to say by and by.

It would be fascinating for us, as a body or individually, to trace the development of ministerial education and to speak of the establishment of the theological schools in Alexandria and Antioch,

the marvelous training of church workers by St. Augustine in Africa, the convent and cathedral schools of the Middle Ages, the rise of the universities and their role in this field, the methods employed by Luther and his co-workers, especially Melancthon, in supplying the Church with pastors and teachers, the provisions made in Europe in the 18th and 19th centuries to secure the needed clergy, the history of ministerial training in the United States, the instruction given by consecrated pastors in a private capacity to promising young men that desired to take up the Gospel ministry, the first Lutheran Seminary here in America, and in general the founding of our theological schools, bringing before us scenes both touching and edifying. While a historical survey including the matters mentioned could well be brought within the scope of my theme, I believe that our discussion will be more profitable if we confine ourselves to the important doctrinal and practical questions that present themselves when the relations between the Church and the seminary are studied.

I

To get a good start in our discussion, let me state that to all of us, I believe, it is an axiomatic proposition that if it wishes to follow God's directions, a Church has to have ministers and teachers. It might be thought by somebody that our having the office of the ministry is an arrangement which Christians have arrived at without divine direction and sanction, merely by the exercise of their own consecrated intelligence and wisdom, perceiving that it would be wise and profitable to entrust certain people with the teaching function. We have, for example, quite generally in our churches the position of organist. Everybody considers the service rendered by such a person useful; but I have not heard it said that this position rests on a divine provision or ordinance and that the Church would be sinning against the definitely expressed will of God if it endeavored to do without it. That the preaching and teaching of the Word by special persons is something that God Himself directs us to have and foster, we see, for example, from what Jesus says to His disciples in the well-known passage Matt. 9: "The harvest truly is plenteous, but the laborers are few; pray ye, therefore, the Lord of the harvest that He will send forth laborers into His harvest." Certainly, if we are to pray for a certain service, that service must be something that God desires us to have and cultivate. Our dogmaticians point particularly to Titus 1:5: "For this cause left I thee in Crete that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting and ordain elders in every city, as I had appointed thee." In the churches on Crete, founded by Paul, there were things that were still wanting when he departed. The churches were not yet completely equipped as Paul

desired them to be, and a factor still lacking was a duly authorized and properly equipped ministry, and Titus is told by Paul to see to it that this want be supplied. I may add that this view of the position of Christian pastors and teachers is the one which throughout the centuries has quite generally been taken by Christians. They have not looked upon such a position as a convenience with which the Church provided itself, but as a divinely instituted service which the Church cannot neglect to introduce and maintain without disobedience to her Master.

II

Another proposition axiomatic to all Lutherans must at once follow. It is this: The Church has not received any direction from its divine Lord and Master as to the precise way in which its workers are to be trained and prepared, whether in special schools or some other way. On this head, too, not much need be said. Though many erroneous notions have risen in the course of time touching the office of the ministry, I do not recall having read that any Lutheran theologian has maintained that Christ or the Apostles have given us instruction on the question as to whether ministers have to be trained in what we call schools or in some other manner. We see that here, as in other spheres, Christ has treated the New Testament Church like a man having attained the age of majority, when he can himself make decisions and chart his course. It is true that there are church bodies which are opposed to having a school-trained ministry. Their position is not, if I understand it correctly, that Jesus has expressly forbidden the Church to have schools in which ministers and teachers are educated, but rather that since in the early days of Christianity there were no seminaries, we must assume it to be God's will that we should not have any either. This argument has been exposed so frequently that I need not dignify it by presenting counterarguments. In brief, God has not commanded the establishment of theological seminaries, neither has He forbidden it. Here we move in the realm of that glorious liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free (Gal. 5:1).

III

When in the usual way we say that the Church looks to the seminary for its pastors, another truth must be adduced to put our statement in the right light. I refer to the Scriptural teaching that pastors are gifts of the exalted Christ bestowed on the Church. The seminary is a nursery according to the etymological meaning of the word. It is the place where the seeds are put into the ground and from where, after the plant has developed, it can be taken to the location of its permanent usefulness. According to this

etymology the name is to signify that at the seminary young men are to be trained and prepared who, when this process has been completed, can in the various communities fill the teaching positions for which men are needed. When Paul looked upon the Church of his day, supplied as it was with church workers, leaders, teachers of various types, he was moved to utter words of admiration and joy. "But unto everyone of us is given grace according to the measure of the gift of Christ. Wherefore he saith, When He ascended up on high, He led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men. (Now that He ascended, what is it but that He also descended first into the lower parts of the earth? He that descended is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens, that He might fill all things.) And He gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ; till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ," Eph. 4:7-13. The reason why I quote this passage here is to bring out that Paul regarded the church workers whom he enumerates, apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors, and teachers, as gifts which Christ, who had ascended above all heavens, granted to His Church here on earth. I am convinced that we are not reading too much into these words of the Apostle when we say that wherever we meet a true Christian pastor and teacher, we behold a gift of God. The brother may be lacking in some social graces; his accent may vex some people; his knowledge of sociology and economics may be rather embryonic; and there may be certain best sellers that he has never looked into: if he preaches the Gospel of Jesus Christ in its fullness, purity, and sweetness, and is totally, body and soul, devoted to the service of his Master, he is one of the jewels of the Church, a real gift from above. If he was graduated from our particular seminary, then, while we rejoice, let us bear in mind that our school was merely the instrument of Christ in preparing this man for his important and glorious work. It is not necessary to labor the point; but it had to be mentioned because we are in danger of forgetting that, after all, it is Christ Himself who moves men's hearts so that they become willing to be His messengers, and that it is He who through His Spirit grants them faith, devotion, a spiritual understanding of the saving truth, patience, zeal—all of them possessions without which the mere acquisition of intellectual knowledge and mental brilliancy would be of little avail. The recent attempts made by all seminaries, I suppose, to achieve if possible a more satisfactory scholastic foundation and in an increased degree to do work which does not have to fear com-

parison with that done in theological departments at famous universities here and abroad are laudable. But these efforts must not obscure for us the truth that in the last analysis it is Christ on whom the success of our educational endeavors depends. The seminaries, then, must proceed on their way not in the spirit of haughty pride, which glories in the high scholastic standards of the particular school and in the distinction it has attained among the educational institutions of the country — desirable though such things may be — but in the spirit of humble trust which prayerfully looks to the risen and ascended Savior to make its service to the Church satisfactory, important, and vital.

IV

When we look a little more closely at the relations between the seminary and the Church, we shall have to say that under present conditions it would be extremely difficult for the Church to do its work without the seminary. In the Colonial days, as we now think exclusively of our own country, we find that it was possible for a Christian minister to conduct a little ministerial training school in his own home. I imagine in the instances where this was done the pastor and his good wife, in an admirable spirit of unselfish devotion, resolved to undertake the utmost in the sphere of Christian hospitality and took in the lads that were eager to be instructed. Since the success or failure of a school does not depend primarily on the equipment it can boast, but on its teacher or teachers, it may be that by the method mentioned some exceedingly good results were achieved and excellent ministers provided for the Church. Alas! in the days in which we live, days of hurry, haste, and worry, of multifarious activities for the pastor and endless social obligations for his wife, this method is out of the question and can be mentioned merely as a historical curiosity or phenomenon, reminding us that there were initiative, enterprise, achievement, and true consecration in that early period as well as now. Just as we have placed almost everything else on a joint social basis, for instance, the practice of charity toward the poor and the aged, so the churches feel, and justly so, that the training of pastors and teachers, if it is to be efficiently done in our complex age, must be a joint undertaking. It would be difficult to find a pastor competent to teach all the subjects which present-day conditions prescribe; and if you found such a person, you would probably discover that he does not have the time for the herculean labor that would be involved. Hence we regard the seminary, modern life being what it is, as almost indispensable to the churches in their efforts to provide for themselves and for the mission fields a properly equipped ministry.

V

If what has just been said is tenable, it can be argued with a good deal of cogency that the Church should control the seminaries on which it depends for its pastors and teachers. I referred before to private enterprises, undertaken by God-fearing, devoted pastors, to train future ministers. It is worthy of note that a goodly number of our theological schools were founded not by church bodies, but by one or several theologians who, acting in a private or semiprivate capacity, planted an urgently needed tree. By and by the church body that was being served was ready, or a church body came into existence prepared to give the school an official status and to adopt it as its own institution. As far as I can observe, the opinion has always been strong in the Lutheran Church of America that, to do its work properly, the Church should be in control of the schools on which it relies for its supply of spiritual leaders. That we are here treating of a subject possessing not merely academic interest, but having practical importance and implications is quite evident. As we all know, there are a number of seminaries and divinity schools in existence which are not controlled by a church body, but are conducted by a private corporation, and the question arises whether, after all, such a status of independence from church control is not the one a seminary should aspire to have. These schools, as, for instance, Union Seminary, New York, are heavily endowed; the funds are sufficient for the maintenance of the institution; no more or less painful solicitation of the moneys required to staff the school and to keep the library and other equipment up to date is needed. Perhaps to one or the other of us a seminary thus situated appears as a veritable haven of refuge, especially if it has been our lot in a representative capacity to experience cruel financial agonies as we were fighting for the very life of our school. But while the financial worries of a seminary which has to rely entirely on the direct support of its church body are in many instances only too real, vexing, and discouraging, and while at times other uncomfortable conditions may arise from church control, I hold that it would be a mistaken course if we sought to achieve for our theological schools a position of freedom from the governing control of their church bodies. The Church, needing the Word of God and the Sacraments, should be able to erect and govern the institutions furnishing it dispensers of the Word and Sacraments. What a precarious situation for a city to be in if it has to depend for its water supply on the good will of an individual who owns the lake in the mountains from where conduits take the water to the city! Since it cannot exist without the means of grace, the Church is most vitally interested in the character of the schools where the men are trained that will ad-

minister these means. It must have the Word and the Sacraments pure, unadulterated, as they came from the hand of God, not a substitute for them, no falsification. Hence it cannot well afford to leave the preparation of its ministers to an outside or private agency. If that means struggles, heartaches, and disappointments for the seminary authorities, we feel sorry for them, but declare the hardships must be borne for the sake of the well-being of the Church itself. That besides the vital point mentioned there are other advantages connected with church control of the seminaries, that, for instance, the interest of the church members in a school of which they are part owners and part governors, is likely to be more real and active than in a school with which they have no organic connection, needs no demonstration.

VI

Quite naturally the question arises, how this control of the seminary by the Church is to be exercised. Is the Church to elect the members of the faculty directly at its conventions, or should it entrust these elections to a committee? Should the board of managers be chosen by the Church for life, or should the members of this board serve merely from one convention to the other? Should the Church at its regular meetings determine the curriculum of the school? To what extent should the faculties be permitted to introduce and mold the courses of study that are to be offered? In looking at these and similar questions one will say that no hard and fast rules beyond those prescribed by a loving interest of the Church in the seminary and by sanctified common sense should be laid down. The Church that legislates too copiously concerning its theological schools will probably find that it defeats its own purpose, just as much as the Church which is too hesitant to occupy itself with the affairs of the school and grants too much authority to the board of directors and the faculty. Let the Church adhere in its supervision and guidance to the fundamentals, the broad general principles, and leave the details to competent committees and individuals.

VII

We are at this conference, I am quite sure, not so much concerned with the attitude of the Church toward the seminary as with that of the seminary toward the Church. We represent primarily the seminary, and what we desire is to see to it that our own house has been, or will be, set in order. Naturally, we shall not begrudge the church authorities, if any of them are present, a word of good advice, either. As members of the faculties of Lutheran seminaries we should all have the strong conviction that next to our exalted heavenly King the Church is our superior, to whom we

owe allegiance, service, and obedience. These are hackneyed phrases, I realize, but owing to the difficulty of the fulfillment of our duties in this sphere, I hope you will not object to my mentioning the subject. It is quite easy for theological professors, owing to their special training, the leadership they have to assume in the classroom, and the many times they are appealed to for counsel and direction by former students and others, to fall into the error of looking upon the Church as a mere adjunct of the seminary, instead of always bearing in mind that the seminary exists for the benefit of the Church, that the latter is the mistress, the seminary the servant. Whoever accepts a call as professor at one of our Lutheran seminaries is not thereby authorized to follow any course whatever which a scholar's whims and inclinations may dictate; he is not put into a laboratory where he may experiment and speculate to his heart's content. He and his colleagues, together with the student body and the board of directors, are not sovereign; they are servants of the Church which called the professors, elected the board of directors, and is sending its consecrated young men that have the ministry in view to the institution. That there may come a time when a seminary for reasons of conscience will refuse to follow the mandate of its Church, is conceivable; but of such exceptional situations I am not thinking now.

VIII

What must be the chief aim of the seminary in its endeavor to serve the Church? The answer is, of course, obvious. Its aim must be to furnish the Church the kind of pastors it requires for its life and development. Here we again can and hence should place ourselves on the definite foundation of Holy Scripture, because God Himself through the Apostles has told us what the qualifications and characteristics of a Christian minister should be. The Church naturally wishes the seminary to furnish it candidates of this kind. If you scrutinize the chief sections of the New Testament in which these things are listed, 1 Tim. 3, Titus 1, 1 Pet. 5, you at once see that you can divide the requirements into three classes, such as pertain to the intellect, such as belong to the heart, or the spiritual life, and such as have to do with the special "skills" (to use this modern term) of a pastor and teacher. It is when we survey these passages of Holy Writ that the magnitude of the task confronting a seminary becomes an appalling reality to us, and we exclaim, Who is sufficient for these things? (2 Cor. 2:16.) It is not my intention to give a comprehensive exegetical discussion of the respective Scripture passages, beneficial though such an undertaking would be, but merely to select a few representative terms to guide us in our thinking of ministerial qualifications.

I alluded to intellectual requirements. Our pastors are to be teachers of their flocks. As teachers, they must have something they can teach, knowledge that they can impart to those that are entrusted to their care. They are to be preachers. The first requisite for anybody that is to assume the role of a preacher is that he have a message which he can proclaim. In the catalog of characteristics of elders or bishops given Titus 1, Paul says, v. 9, that the bishop must be "holding fast the faithful word as he hath been taught, that he may be able by sound doctrine both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers." You have to grant an old grammarian a few words of technical exegesis on this passage. The faithful word (*pistos logos*) is evidently the Gospel message as Paul had preached it. It is *pistos*, it can be relied on; it is worthy of all credence. Paul adds a modifier: *kata teen didacheen*. The reliable word which is in keeping with the teaching is to be adhered to. A person might, on account of the position of the prepositional phrase, be inclined to view it as belonging exclusively to the adjective *pistou*, so that the meaning would result, "Adhering to the word which, as my teaching has shown, is reliable." There is nothing wrong with such a construction, except that, so it strikes me at least, the noun "teaching" in that case should be followed by the possessive *mou*. I prefer to take another possible view, which regards *pistou logou* as one term and the prepositional phrase as belonging to that term. The meaning resulting under such a view is, "Let him adhere to the reliable word in the form in which it has been taught," or, as others translate, "according to the Christian doctrine." Newport White, in the *Exp. Gr. N. T.*, translates: "the faithful word which is in accordance with the teaching." We need not, for our present purpose, go into further details. It is evident that the candidate for the holy ministry is, according to St. Paul's specifications, to have acquaintance with the message that the Apostles had proclaimed. The emphasis which St. Paul in the Pastoral Epistles puts on "sound doctrine" or "sound words" abundantly testifies that to be properly equipped for the Gospel ministry, a person must know the doctrines taught in the Holy Scriptures. He must know them so that he can properly instruct and exhort, on the one hand, and, on the other, oppose successfully those that refuse to bow to the Word.

What has just been said indicates that we have to lead our students to have acquaintance with the doctrines of the Holy Scriptures. They must know what the doctrinal sections of the Bible inculcate, and in order to understand these sections, they must become acquainted with the Bible in general, the historical sections included. In other words, to comprehend the meaning of a text, you must study the context, too. If now and then, as it is

charged, our Lutheran dogmaticians disregarded this principle, the fault lay not so much with their rules of hermeneutics as with their application of these rules. All this implies that the view to be taught the students must be that of the Scriptures themselves, which is that the Scriptures are the inerrant, infallible Word of our great God, given us for our guidance and our everlasting happiness.

The sound doctrine of the Scriptures — we Lutheran theologians are convinced that this doctrine has been laid down in a more or less systematic form in our Lutheran Confessions. The churches that maintain, support, and conduct our seminaries likewise hold that conviction. Without assuming that Luther and his co-workers were inspired in the technical sense of that term, we believe that through God's undeserved grace these men did set forth the Scripture teaching in its old, apostolic purity and that hence in the writings which they produced and which the Church accepted as expressing its faith we possess the sound doctrine of which St. Paul speaks. If we, then, wish to teach our students this sound doctrine we must, among other things, acquaint them with our grand classic confessional writings.

There is another fact to be considered in this connection. Our dear Lutheran Church is a historic Church. It was born in a period of tremendous stress, strife, and controversy. A heroic age it was when the foundations were laid and our Confessions were produced. There breathes in these writings the spirit of noble courage, of unselfish consecration, of high resolve to adhere to the revealed truth at all hazards. It was this spirit which gave our Church one of its distinctive characteristics — that of simple loyalty to the Scriptures, regardless of traditions and of ecclesiastical prestige, on the one hand, and of rationalistic considerations on the other. Our church bodies wish to see this spirit of loyalty to the Scriptures fostered and perpetuated in the seminaries, so that the pastors of the congregations will set forth in their sermons and their catechetical instruction the grand truths that Luther and his co-workers bravely and consistently confessed and defended. We ourselves, I am sure, share this desire of our church bodies. Our aim, then, must be to labor faithfully to bring about in our students, in the first place, the intellectual apprehension of the great teachings that the reforming and founding fathers zealously and successfully sponsored.

A faithful presentation of the truths set forth in our Confessions will have the result that the students will come to see what is the heart of the Scriptures, the doctrine of justification by grace through faith, for in tireless fashion our Lutheran confessors keep the attention focused on this teaching, having as its foundation

the message of universal redemption. There they will be led to appreciate the concepts of sin and grace, of Law and the Gospel—all of them matters on which the Church wishes its pastors and teachers to be informed so that they can speak on them with Scriptural clarity and definiteness.

IX

I have now placed before you some paragraphs which have to do with an intellectual requisite sought in our graduates—knowledge of the doctrines taught in the Scriptures. You undoubtedly have the same feeling as I—that merely the surface has been scratched. But we must hasten on to the next set of requirements which the Church, basing on the Scriptures, looks for in the candidates graduated from the theological seminary. I have before called them qualities of the heart, of the spiritual life. Listen to these words in Titus 1:8: "The bishop must be a lover of hospitality, a lover of good men, sober, just, holy, temperate." When you read all the specifications, you will soon notice that qualities of the heart, that is, qualities constituting the Christian life, are most prominent. The Church, we may add, desires to have, and should have, saintly pastors. Of our Dr. Walther it is reported that in the last months of his life, when he was lying on what proved to be his deathbed, he uttered the prayer "Gott erhalte unserer Synode ein frommes Ministerium" (May God preserve to our Synod a pious clergy). It is the prayer of all of us. We realize that mere head acquaintance with the Scripture truths, an orthodoxy which consists in nothing but correct conceptions on all the various heads of Christian doctrine, is altogether insufficient to make a person fit for the Christian ministry. We all realize, I am sure, the importance of furnishing our Church with candidates who are men of faith, prayer, true charity, earnest devotion to their work, who are fearless in the service of the truth, self-sacrificing in their dealings with their fellow men, humble and self-effacing, and yet manly and courageous. The Church desires to have pastors who espouse orthodox teachings, but who hold these teachings not merely as philosophical propositions or as intellectual ballast, but as convictions which are dearer to them than life itself. Orthodoxy must be not merely of the head, but of the heart. How can the seminary produce pastors that are not only intellectually well equipped, but who are truly pious, God-fearing, earnest Christians? The seminary cannot do it, we all say; God must do it through His Word and Spirit. But we are His instruments. In which way can we most effectively use the Word to bring about the blessed result? Is there anyone of us who can view our task without fear and trembling? The minute

that we stress the scholastic aspect of our work, leading our students to immerse themselves with all the vigor they are capable of in learned studies, we are in danger of neglecting the spiritual side of the student's life, and *vice versa*. I need hardly mention that on account of the abnormal times in which we live both aspects are in great peril of being disregarded.

It may be that at times we teachers feel that our responsibility ends after we have delivered our lecture and corrected the examination papers that have been written under our direction, and that the students' spiritual life is a concern of the students themselves. We have perhaps enviously observed the instructors at secular institutions who at least in some instances are interested in teaching their particular subject satisfactorily and in nothing else. But a minute's reflection must show us that apart from not fulfilling our duty toward the students placed in our charge, we are not true to our obligations toward the Church if we follow such a *laissez faire* course in this sphere. The Church expects us to furnish, as far as in us lies, real men of God. It has a right to expect it.

X

About the third set of qualifications, those pertaining to the special "skills" of a minister, I shall not say much. Paul says the minister must be *didaktikos*, "apt to teach." Hence it must be our aim to make our ministers able preachers and teachers. Our courses in homiletics and catechetics are designed to fill that need. Today, when an increasing number of our congregation members are college graduates, when practically everyone of our adolescent boys and girls attends the high school and every time the pastor speaks in public there are a number of critics scrutinizing severely both what he says and how he says it—I say, that today we have to be more zealous than ever in cultivating this branch of our instruction will be granted by all.

XI

It may be that one or the other of you who does me the honor of listening to me, in hearing me discourse in this fashion on the kind of men the Church desires the seminary to furnish can hardly suppress a smile, and says within himself, "What a hopelessly old-fashioned talk this is! That man is still living in the first half of the nineteenth century. He apparently has never heard of sociology and economics, of the leadership pastors are to exercise in their communities, their function as members of war-chest committees, as advisers of the juvenile courts. One of these mornings he will finally come upon the word psychiatry and rush to the dictionary to ascertain its meaning." So, I fancy, runs the charge. What shall we old-fashioned folks say? That the Church desires

its pastors to be well educated goes without saying. Here we are all agreed. But now let me state that, as far as my observation goes, while the Church desires its pastors to be specialists, it wants them to be specialists not in economics or sociology or psychiatry, but in theology, in religion, in the Bible. I know quite well some flourishing congregations, having in their midst highly educated as well as poorly educated folk, the pastors of which are simply Bible theologians. The members of these churches are satisfied with, and edified by, the Scriptural discourses of their pastors and would not wish to have ministers of a different kind. Just as little as a church expects its pastor to be an expert in medicine and in the diagnosis of diseases, able to tell whether a parishioner's stomach is suffering from an oversupply or a deficiency of acids, so little does it demand that he be an economic expert, able to solve income-tax perplexities for the bewildered people in his community. But it does desire to have a minister who can tell it what the Word of God says about the use of medicine in general and about a Christian's duty toward the Government.

XII

What of the charge that our seminaries do not educate the student sufficiently with respect to the thought currents, the systems of philosophy and of theology that are influential in the world at large these days? The names Kirkegaard, Barth, and Brunner, to mention only a few, are on the lips of all. To what extent do we, to what extent should we, acquaint our students with the ideas and the work of these men? What of the philosophies of Santayana, Dewey, Whitehead, Hocking, and others? Here in my opinion a middle course should be taken. The seminary must adhere to the fundamentals dwelt on before without neglecting to give our prospective pastors the proper background for an understanding of the present-day world by placing before them information on the theological and philosophical tendencies that are prominent. Here is a place where one of our difficulties lies, a veritable *Spannung*, or tension. That seminary is fortunate whose teachers are wise enough to strike the proper balance between the eternal and the ephemeral, the absolutely essential and the merely desirable. The churches will be found indulgent, provided the pastors we furnish them are truly pious and consecrated as well as men of practical ability in the pulpit.

XIII

There are a host of other points one would like to discuss. I shall merely mention one or two. What must be the relation between the seminary and the Church as far as leadership in religious thinking and in church practice is concerned? Should

the Church lead the seminary, or should the seminary lead the Church, or what should be their mutual status? The question is much discussed in liberal seminaries and divinity schools where, naturally, the position is taken that the seminary is marching at the head of the procession and the Church should follow even though the latter finds the leadership not to its liking and loses breath and balance in endeavoring to keep in step. For us the problem does not exist. We have our priceless Confessions; on them the Church and the seminary stand together. It is true that new issues constantly arise, so that conditions are never static. Today a new system of philosophy may knock at the doors of the learned, and the seminary through its faculty has to take cognizance of it in order to give information and proper evaluation to the students and the clergy on the new phenomenon. Tomorrow there may come a new political development that agitates people's minds, and the pastors at once have to grapple with it, and by and by repercussions reach the seminary, and the professors of the practical department make a mental or visible notation in their lecture outlines on the newcomer. Let them realize, the seminary and the Church, that they are waging one and the same battle, fighting for the same cause, the cause of the saving Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ.

XIV

There is one thought which I should not like to leave unexpressed, and it can form a fitting conclusion for this paper. Our seminaries should not regard themselves primarily as schools of scientific study and research, but rather as schools of holy propaganda, endeavoring to help the Church in bringing the message of redemption to as many people as possible. We have to have at our seminaries earnest, concentrated study of all questions of theology. Obscurantism was not the ideal of the early Church, it was not that of Luther and his fellow workers, nor should it be ours. Nor should we think that the Church must be built with the dash and power of pure emotionalism. But at the same time let us beware of regarding our seminaries as cloistered laboratories established for the training of profound scholars. Scholarship with us, though we exalt it highly, must be merely a means to an end. The Church, as I have abundantly intimated, has a practical purpose in mind when it establishes and maintains seminaries. Let us, too, who are privileged to teach in Lutheran seminaries, recognize that practical purpose, make it our own, and with God's help send forth diligent and willing laborers into the harvest, which is appallingly great. In doing this we shall serve the Church, and, what is more, we shall serve our exalted Lord, sitting at the right hand of the Father. W. ARNDT

Outlines on Old Testament Texts (Synodical Conference)

Seventh Sunday after Trinity

1 Kings 17:1-16

Dark days are affecting the people of our country. In spite of the wisdom of men, in spite of international food conferences, things look gloomy for the future, for the days of war, for the days of postwar reconstruction.

Our text of today gives us a dark picture of drought, crop failure, and famine, but it also gives us the bright picture of God's wonderful care for His people. It speaks to us of

The Wonderful Providence of God

1. *God wonderfully provides for the body*
2. *God also provides for the soul*

I

A. V.1. Israel had forsaken God and was practicing idolatry. Now God would withdraw His dew and His rain, and the consequence could only be famine. Lev. 26:19, 20; Deut. 11:16, 17. What Elijah prophesied came true. Soon famine struck the land, but God took care of His Prophet.

B. Vv. 2-6. A description of the wonderful providence of God.

C. It is well to bear in mind that, though God provided well for His prophet, He provided not the luxuries of life but the essentials: water, bread, meat. God still does this today. When we pray the Fourth Petition, God still hears our prayer. Ordinarily He provides for us through the regular means, through hard work and the forces of nature. He provides for little children through the activities of their parents. But surely the story of Elijah should teach us that God's arm is not shortened. In days of need God may not send ravens, but He may send a special gift from an unknown source, a new job with higher wages, new health and strength to enable us to go back to work. It may not be my way, it may not be thy way, and yet in His own way the Lord will provide.

D. Vv. 7-16 present two evidences of God's providing care. God supplied not only the necessary food for His prophet, but also for the hospitable widow and her son.

E. It is well to remember that God at times sends us where we had not planned to go. Text, vv. 3, 9; Jonah 1:2, 3. Our soldiers and sailors at the present time are scattered over the length

and breadth of the land, yea, of the world, sent by their government, the arm of God. They are in the hand of God. He will provide for them, not merely food for the body, but also shelter. It is well for us to remind ourselves of the wonderful care of God in these trying days.

2

A. Our text does not emphasize the spiritual care of God as much as the care of the body. Yet sufficient evidence of such care can be found in the text. Elijah was a child of God, a Prophet who had bravely brought the wicked king a prophecy of doom. V. 1. He may have wondered what the future held in store for him. The glorious promises of God, vv. 4 and 9, cheered him. Faith was made stronger through these promises. When God kept promise, Elijah was strengthened in his trust in the almighty power of Jehovah. God thus provided for Prophet also spiritually. God does the same thing for Christians today. Through promises of Word, through fulfillment of these promises, faith is increased, trust grows.

B. God provided for soul of Prophet also through tests of faith. Severe tests of faith: (a) when brook dried up; (b) to be sent to a widow, for widows ordinarily are poor, (c) to find that the widow had only handful of flour, little oil in cruse. These tests were the means of God to strengthen his faith. Thus God again provided spiritually for Elijah. The trials of our times, the stress of wartime economy, are sent by God today to test us and help us grow stronger spiritually.

C. By sending the Prophet to house of the widow God also provided food for her soul. The prophet broke the bread of life to them. When the Prophet had restored the dead son (1 Kings 17:17, 21, 22) she exclaimed: 1 Kings 17:24. This is clear evidence that God had also provided for the widow in spiritual matters.

D. God does this today. Food may become scarcer, but He still gives us Bread of Life in abundance. Many of our soldiers and sailors have more of the Word today than in civilian life. Many civilians have learned much from the Word in these days of war. Yes, God still provides, provides in a wonderful way for body and soul. Praises for such a wonderful God should daily fill our soul. Ps. 103:1-3.

E. L. ROSCHKE

Eighth Sunday after Trinity

Jer. 23:21-32

Men applaud the "broad-minded" spirit which ignores doctrinal differences in an attempt to unite all churches. The term

"false prophets" has been removed from the unionist's vocabulary. God's Word, however, censures false prophets in unmistakable language. See today's Gospel.

The Lord's Indictment of False Prophets

1

They place themselves above God.

1. False prophets are arrogant. (a) They usurp divine authority, v. 21. Presume to be God's messenger, vv. 27, 28. Such people as Joseph Smith, of the Mormons; Ann Lee, of the Shakers (who claimed to be an incarnate revelation of God); Mrs. Mary Baker Eddy, "mother" of Christian Science; E. Swedenborg, forerunner of modern Spiritism; Mrs. Ellen White, prophetess of the Adventists; the "infallible" Pope; all types of mystics;—are dreamers, v. 25. A more subtle type of dreamers are the Modernists, who say that God has not revealed Himself, that divine revelation is not necessary because man can find God in his own experience. Thus every individual becomes a "dreamer." What arrogance! God says: John 1:18; man says: I am fully competent to determine God's being and work. (b) They seem to have strong credentials: their visions, the "scientific" method. But examine the results! Vv. 23, 24. They do not comprehend the very elementary knowledge of God's being, His omnipresence and omniscience. Examine some of the dreams! The heathen: a god in the likeness of a beast; the Mormons: God a glorified man with phallic powers; Christian Science: God is only Divine Mind; Modernism: a God who is limited in wisdom and power, a full-grown human being; the Papacy: a God who can be reconciled by humanly devised works of penance. In short, human reason is unable to rise above its own level, dreams of God, of the plan of salvation, of heaven in carnal concepts. And yet false prophets exclaim arrogantly: We know all about God, for we have carefully examined our visions, our "scientific" data.

2. To make matters worse, the dreamers pretend to speak for God. They cover their arrogance by deception, v. 28. "Falsehood mingled with truth is a powerful error, and the beauty of truth serves as an ornamental covering to its deformity." (Lange-Schaff Commentary.) The pure-food laws do not forbid sale of strychnine, but its sale as Vitamin B-1. False prophets ape true prophets. God did use dreams to reveal Himself. But when false prophets arose, God warned against "dreamers," Deut. 13:1 ff. The indictment is: The dreamers are dishonest, vv. 30, 31. They are impostors. They deceive by God's name, v. 25, and commit a double sin. Luther's explanation of the Second Commandment.

2

They cause irreparable harm to immortal souls.

Prophets are sent to preach salvation. Israel was at the brink of ruin, nationally, morally, spiritually. Why? v. 22.—A prophet has been defined as one who is able to crystallize the vague ideas and desires of the masses. This definition applies to false prophets who preach what people want to hear, 2 Tim. 4:3, 4.

1. False prophets cause the hearers to forget God's name, v. 27. Cp. Judg. 3:7. Idolatry results: (a) Man fixes his own standard of morality, which is relatively low; (b) man devises his own plan of salvation, which is legalistic, *i. e.*, work-righteousness through man-made commandments, or rationalistic, *i. e.*, an attempt to harmonize mysteries in Scripture, *e. g.*, personal union of Christ, conversion, predestination.

2. A mingling of truth and error results in the loss of the truth, v. 30 b. (a) Man's dreams are chaff, God's Word is wheat, vv. 28 b, 29.—God's Word a power to break the stony heart of man and to purge it from sin. The only means to save. And this priceless treasure is at stake! A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump. An incipient error may lead to the loss of the whole truth. (b) False pophets substitute their vain dreams for eternal verities and thus cause their hearers to err and to be lost.

God's severe indictment, v. 32. In His grace He preserves a remnant, which is not misled. The Lord is zealous for His honor and for the welfare of His Church. Are we? F. E. MAYER

Ninth Sunday after Trinity

Ex. 32:1-14

A certain missionary went to a heathen land and tried to persuade the natives that there is a God. They laughed and told him that they had known it long before he came. This knowledge is something universal. Rom. 1:19, 20. Therefore also some form of worship is found wherever one goes in the world.

The mere knowledge that there is a God is not enough. God wants to be known of men not as they *imagine* Him to be but as He *is* and as He has revealed Himself in the Bible. The first of the Ten Commandments, "I am the Lord, thy God. Thou shalt have no other gods before Me." All worship of other gods is condemned in the Bible as idolatry.

The Sin of Idolatry

1. Who commits it
2. How it degrades man
3. What wrath it brings upon him
4. How he can be cleansed from it

1

When we think of idolatry, we think of India, China, darkest Africa. But in our text Israel, the chosen people of God, who had witnessed the miracles of God in Egypt, had passed miraculously through the Red Sea, were being fed daily with manna from heaven, had witnessed the giving of the Law amid mighty manifestations of Jehovah on Sinai—Israel makes the demand "Up, make us gods," etc., v. 1.

Aaron, the brother of Moses, who had been reared in the house of God-fearing Amran and Jochebed, who had later been Moses' "prophet" before Pharaoh, who had been appointed to lead the people while Moses was in the Mount, Aaron demands: V. 2. The people obey, v. 3. Aaron fashions the golden calf, v. 4; proclaims the idol feast, v. 5.

Who commits the sin of idolatry? Not only people who have never heard of the true God, but millions in so-called Christian lands, yes, in the visible Church. Often leaders in the visible Church.

How? Not by fashioning with their hands gods of wood, stone, and metal, but (a) by teaching and believing perverted notions of God. Modernism with its denial of the deity of Christ. John 5:23. So lodge religion; (b) by the fine idolatry of mammon worship, belly service, idolatrous trust in science, education, etc. See Schwan, First Commandment.

This fine idolatry fearfully common. Have we ever yielded to it? Let us not rashly conclude that it could not happen. It does happen. Remember Israel. Remember Aaron.

2

Idolatry is a degrading sin. Aaron degraded himself and Israel mentally and physically. Mental degradation, v. 4b: "These be thy gods," etc. Mental and physical degradation at the feast the next day, vv. 5, 6. People gave themselves up to the foolish notion that in the calf they were worshiping Jehovah, who had expressly forbidden such worship. Ex. 20:4.

So idolatry today. Mental degradation, Rom. 1:21, 22. True also of the fine idolatry of so-called Christians.

3

All idolatry arouses the wrath of God and demands punishment, v. 7. "Thy people"—as though God had already disowned them. Vv. 8, 9, 10. "Let Me alone, that My wrath may wax hot against them and that I may consume them."

Throughout the history of Israel her troubles are traceable to her idolatry. Books of Judges and Kings.

God is no less angered by, and aroused to punish, fine idolatry. Eph. 5:5; Jer. 17:5.

4

Is there no escape for the idolater from his sin and from its dread consequences? Moses intercedes for Israel, vv. 11-13. Asks God to be merciful for His honor's sake and for the sake of His promises to the patriarchs. The heart and core of these promises is Christ. God was entreated and repented of the evil, etc., v. 14.

So today there is forgiveness even for the sin of idolatry. Christ, the very heart and core of prophecy, has appeared and has redeemed the world from all sins, also from the sin of idolatry.

Conclusion: Our hearts also by nature idolatrous. And often, in weakness, we also have fallen into fine idolatry. Let us come penitently to the Throne of Grace, imploring God for forgiveness for Jesus' sake. Then let us go and worship the Lord, our God, and serve Him only. Let us have no other gods before Him, but let us fear, love, and trust in Him above all things. FRED KRAMER

Tenth Sunday after Trinity

Deut. 4:23-31

The traditional pericope for this Sunday presents our Savior as weeping over Jerusalem. Those sacred tears were tears of love. Jerusalem had rejected Him. Still Christ loved the reprobate city, though in His righteous wrath He had to mete out destructive punishment. — The world today walks in the footsteps of ancient, wicked Jerusalem. Nevertheless God's love toward it continues, showing itself in the proclamation of both the Law and the Gospel. A worthy, timely thought to consider!

God's Wonderful Love

revealed in the preaching of

1. *His condemning Law*
2. *His inviting, forgiving Gospel*

1

1. Our text is a portion of an address made by Moses to the children of Israel at Shittim, at the close of his life. It is hortatory and prophetic in nature, partly Law and partly Gospel — severe Law and sweet Gospel.

2. *The Law analyzed.* (a) A warning against carnal security, v. 23; cf. v. 9. (b) A warning against forgetting God's covenant of grace, demanding constant obedience and consecration of Israel, v. 23 b; Ex. 20:1 ff.; Deut. 6:1 ff.; Gen. 17:1 ff. (c) A warning against idolatry, v. 23 c; v. 25.

3. *The curse and condemnation of the Law.* (a) God's fierce wrath, vv. 24, 25. (b) Ejection from the Promised land, v. 26.

(c) Dispersion among the nations, v. 27. (d) Their adoption of pagan idol worship, v. 28. Note the clarity, solemnity, and definiteness of these threats of the Law.

4. Israel did not obey the voice of God but forgot the covenant of the Lord. Judg. 6:1 ff.; 13:1 ff.; 1 Kings 11:1 ff.; 18:18 ff.; 2 Kings 21:1 ff.; Is. 39:1 ff. Israel's history thus is fraught with rank and gross idolatry. And the punishment? The kingdom of Israel destroyed 722 B. C. — Jerusalem destroyed 586 B. C. — After the return from the Babylonian Captivity the Jews (Pharisees) practiced "fine" idolatry, rejected Christ, their Savior, and Jerusalem was destroyed A. D. 70, as Christ in today's Gospel predicted. Ever since then vv. 27 and 28 have remained fulfilled. The Jews remained an unbelieving, hardened, idolatrous people, refusing to believe the divine Law proclaimed to them in saving love.

5. Are we better than they? (a) The world today is idolatrous beyond description, worshiping by gross and fine idolatry the creatures rather than the Creator. God still proclaims in true helping love His divine Law in all severity, at present especially through war and its destruction. But do men hear? (b) And how about the Christian Church? Trace the history of false doctrine through the first centuries and the Middle Ages, the Reformation, and the following centuries to the present day, showing how there has been false doctrine at all times, also in the Lutheran Church. (c) And how about our own Church, which about a century ago our fathers founded upon the pure and unadulterated Word of God? Stress the evils of satiety, doctrinal indifference, carnal security, refusal to serve God with undivided loyalty, the spirit of unionism, of worldliness, and other evils in spite of God's constant proclamation of His divine Law. Is Christ weeping also over us? The present war with its many evils and sorrows is the result not only of the sins of the ungodly world but also of our own, 1 Pet. 4:17, 18. Let us therefore not despise the preaching of God's Law, but accept it in true repentance, since it is our loving God who tells us how serious sin is and how serious its results are. Gal. 6:7, 8; Ps. 143:2; Heb. 9:27.

2

1. God's wonderful love is revealed especially in His gracious proclamation of His inviting, forgiving Gospel. God earnestly desires all sinners to repent, vv. 29, 30: they should seek God, turn to Him, and be obedient to His voice. This we cannot do by our reason or strength. But through the divine Law, God reveals to us our sins, working in us contrition, or sorrow; and through the Gospel He works faith in us, so that we believe in Christ, our Savior, and through Him have forgiveness of sins and eternal life,

and serve Him in newness of life. Rom. 3:19, 20; 1:16, 17; 12:1 ff. Oh, wondrous love! If we seek God, we shall find Him, even in the tribulation of the latter days. Dare we believe this?

2. God tells us this, v. 31. (a) He is merciful, kind, and gracious to those in trouble. Show God's mercies as revealed in Israel's history. (b) He does not forsake nor destroy us, V. 31 b. Compare Israel's history. Believers in Israel returned from the Babylonian Captivity, and even before Jerusalem's final destruction a period of repentance was granted the people, so that God's elect could be brought in. (c) He does not forget the covenant which He has made, v. 31 c. Cf. 2 Pet. 2:9; Rom. 11:1; Is. 54:10; Rom. 8:28. How precious is the Gospel of God's matchless love in Christ Jesus!

3. Jesus weeping over Jerusalem! What an earnest preaching of the divine Law! In those tears were reflected the sins of Israel — and our own. — But also what a comforting preaching of the divine Gospel! In those tears there is salvation for you and me. Jesus weeps, because He loves us; in His tears we have a guarantee of our salvation.

J. THEODORE MUELLER

Eleventh Sunday after Trinity

Micah 2:6-13

Micah was a wartime preacher. His writings are abstracts of sermons delivered during the turbulent reigns of Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah — a time of many wars including the invasions of Sennacherib and the rising threat of Babylonian imperialism. Amid the resultant moral and social chaos, aggravated by the subversive influence of many pseudoprophets, it was not easy to be a faithful preacher of God's truth.

Similar conditions prevail today. Pressure of war and prominence of false religionists make it more difficult for the preacher to be faithful. The liberal rather than the conservative type of preaching is popularly acclaimed. But here in the text of Micah both preachers and hearers have a Biblical example of

Model Wartime Preaching

1

It is uncompromising. V. 6, 7, 11.

Text: No yielding to demand of masses "Prophecy not"; rather a warning that true prophets, if suppressed, would be taken away, v. 6. No conforming to the preaching of those who "walked . . . in falsehood . . . and prophecy . . . of strong drink," v. 11; rather denunciation of it. Above all, unflinching testimony to the om-

nipotence of God's Spirit and Word, as in v. 7 "Is the Spirit of the Lord straitened? Do not My words do good . . . ?" How uncompromising!

APPLICATIONS. — a) War tends to strengthen inclination to compromise on religion. Some claim national unity requires religious uniformity. Unionism, indifference to Christian doctrine and practice increase on the argument that the times demand it. But what the times really demand is Micah's type of preaching — unrestricted, unabridged proclaiming of God's Word.

b) Liberalistic preaching is deemed most patriotic. Actually it is unpatriotic; it does harm rather than good to individual and nation. But faithfully to proclaim the Word which "does good to them that walk uprightly" is the best patriotic service.

c) Preachers, use freedom of speech and religion, for which we are avowedly fighting, to "declare all the counsel of God!" Surrender nothing! Compromise is an attempt "to straiten the Spirit of God."

d) Hearers, scorn the vapid sentimentalities of Modernists! Encourage your preacher by demanding also in these war days preaching that does not compromise with error!

2

It is remonstrating. Vv. 8, 9, 10.

Text. Includes sharp rebukes of prevalent wartime sins — lovelessness toward each other, "as an enemy," v. 8 a; avarice, injustice, "pulling off robe from peaceable travelers," v. 8 b; devouring widows' houses, "women cast out," v. 9 a; enslavement and neglect of children, "deprived of their glory," v. 9 b. All accompanied with solemn threat of divine judgment, "no rest, departure into captivity, sore destruction," v. 10. How remonstrating!

APPLICATIONS. — a) Wars are not only caused by sin (James 4:1), but themselves cause an increase of sin. Note J. E. Hoover's recent reports on the shocking increase of vice and crime. The very sins mentioned by Micah, including the neglect of children, are prevalent in these war days. Never to reprove them is a crime against the state as well as individual souls; it is not model wartime preaching.

b) A recent religious writer says, "I cannot accept the 'judgment of God' view of this war." Many, like him, do not want to hear of sin and divine retribution. But whether they want it or not, is it not duty of preacher to rebuke, remonstrate? 2 Tim. 4:2.

c) Preacher, "cry aloud, spare not, lift up thy voice like a trumpet, and show My people their transgression!" Is. 58:1.

d) Hearers, be not offended at such preaching; it is needed by Church and country, especially in wartime.

3

It is comforting. Vv. 12, 13.

Text. At predictions of judgments some sincere hearts were troubled. What will become of the chosen race from whom the Messiah is to appear, they thought. To comfort them, Micah replied, "I will assemble . . . gather . . . remnant of Israel . . . like sheep of Bozrah," v. 12. And when people asked how, after so dreadful a dispersion and destruction, that could be accomplished, Micah pointed to the Lord, "the Breaker" of all opposition, "the King," "the Lord on the head of them," v. 13. How comforting!

APPLICATIONS. — a) Micah's comforting promise gloriously fulfilled, not only in return of Jews from Babylon but also by the appearance of the Messiah and His kingdom.

b) Amid terrifying judgments of our day troubled Christians ask, What will become of the Church? and some conscience-stricken souls will say, What hope is there for us? If, then, we are to have model wartime preaching, it must contain all the comforting answers of the Gospel.

c) Someone has said, It is not a question of how the Church can survive the present holocaust, but how the world can survive without the Church. But to those who in these war days still ask how the Church can survive, the model wartime preacher will joyously answer, like Micah, "It has the Breaker, who breaks down all obstructions to salvation; it has the King who passes before them; it has the Lord on the head of them, who has been made Head over all things to the Church."

Ask ye, Who is this?
Jesus Christ it is,
Of Sabaoth Lord.
And there's none other God;
He holds the field forever.

ALVIN E. WAGNER



Miscellanea

Do We Need Inspired Scriptures?

In an article published in the *Watchman-Examiner* and having the title "Apology for Literalism" some worth-while remarks are made showing that we need authoritative, divinely given and divinely fixed information on the basis of our Christian faith. The need of Holy Scriptures is brought out. We quote a few of the paragraphs:

"The disciples needed no verbally inspired and accurate document to inform their faith. They had the presence and speech of Christ. But when it came to passing on that knowledge, a difficulty arose. The image of Christ which they carried in their minds was somewhat less than perfect because of human weakness. If they tried to communicate that image in mere words, the weakness of language would further corrupt it. If their readers could read only their words—and they could not see Christ directly—once more the weakness of mind corrupted perception. In a single transmission, sin blurred the original revelation by three degrees. It amounts to this: if transmission of the Gospel were left only to human resources, the knowledge of Christ would be lost in a few generations. For those who have lived since Christ, his revelation is meaningless unless accuracy of transmission is assured.

"If we have nothing better to pass on to the future than the whole accumulation of Christian thought and experience and speculation, and the future must pick and choose without divine aid, the future will be no better off than the Greeks were, as far as a knowledge of God is concerned. In the last analysis, the future's main resource will be its own judgment and reason. Except for those who saw Christ in the flesh, man's need for a revelation is not practically answered, the revelation is incomplete, unless the transmission is as divine as the original. While I personally agree with Ferré's contention that Christianity in heathen lands should develop in accordance with the cultures thereof, that development nevertheless should revolve around and be based upon the Bible. The pioneer missionaries possessed a profound religious insight into the human needs of those lands when they put first in their efforts the translation of the Bible."

A.

The Voice of a Layman in the American Lutheran Church

Under the heading "Let's Unite on Solid Ground" a communication signed "Just an Ordinary Layman" is published in the *Lutheran Standard*, which we here reprint.

"The *Lutheran Standard* has published articles written by both pastors and laymen on the unification of the various Lutheran bodies in America. Invariably it is urged that if unification is impossible at the present time, immediate action should be taken to establish pulpit fellowship. These writers appear to be impatient and cannot account for the delay, since the U. L. C. A. has agreed to the Pittsburgh Agreement.

"I would be more than pleased to see a unified Lutheran Church in

America. A unified Lutheran Church, however, means or should mean more than just an outward union. It must be genuinely Lutheran in a confession of faith and in practice. It must rest on solid ground, and pulpit fellowship cannot be established until the real foundation is under construction.

"I have yet to see a published article that frankly stated the objection or the differences and discussed them pro and con. Even the article on 'Charting the Future Course of American Lutheranism,' by Dr. Ralph H. Long, published in the March issue of the *Women's Missionary Outlook* doesn't bring them out into the open. The article leaves one wondering how, in view of what has been written, Lutherans can remain divided. On further thought one becomes convinced that there is something else which is keeping the Lutheran Church apart, something of greater importance, which must be a conscientious matter.

"What is keeping the U. L. C. A. and the American Lutheran Conference from unification? Is it not the Reformed practices of some of the Lutheran synods in the U. L. C. A.? Furthermore, what about the Masonic pastors in the U. L. C. A.? We all know the stand the Lutheran Church takes in regard to the lodge question. It is bad enough to have Lutheran laymen belong to lodges, but there is absolutely no excuse for a Lutheran pastor being a member of a lodge, particularly the Masonic lodge. The only reason that I can understand why Christians join the Masons or a lodge is that they do not possess sufficient enlightenment of things spiritual, as no man can serve two masters. Masonry makes men brethren and sets up a code to be kept by administering a terrible oath. Christianity makes men brethren by their love for Christ and Christ's love for them.

"If we were to join, or have unification with, the U. L. C. A. under such conditions, we should certainly be going to the extreme left. Where do we differ with Missouri? I do not know. But the way things look to me, we are drifting toward having two bodies in Lutheranism — extremists, or leftists, and the conservatives. There appear to be both of these present in all the American Lutheran bodies, even Missouri. I cannot envision a genuine unification of Lutheranism in America without a purge."

Pastors and "the One Thing Needful"

A member of the editorial staff of *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Prof. John Henry Bennetch, has written an editorial in the April-June number of the journal mentioned which every pastor will read with interest. The editorial has the title "Unpopularity" and considers the startling fact that theological journals have a comparatively small circulation. The reminder of the editorial that we ministers have to continue the study of the Word and of theology is needed by all of us. Let the words of Professor Bennetch be pondered.

"Ayer's well-known *Directory of Newspapers and Periodicals* tabulates with the religious publications to be listed in its pages nine theological magazines. Doubtless, two or three times as many as this are being printed. The significant fact for editorial comment, then, is not the small number but the small circulation which theological material

enjoys today. Several of the nine journals are issuing articles other than the strictly theological type along with religious themes. And yet only one among them can boast a circulation surpassing the 1,000 mark. (A few periodicals had fewer than five hundred copies printed.) Included with the nine magazines were noteworthy productions unrelated to a denomination as well as denominational organs.

"How is the unpopularity of theological journalism to be explained? Poor editorship, poor articles, or poor interest in the ministerial world — which will account for the low tide of productivity? Defects in editing there must be. None of us has passed beyond the realm of imperfection and error. But the mere fact that hundreds of religious and denominational periodicals flourish today would argue against any dearth of editorial acumen, not to speak of the publications which fairly bulge from every newsstand in the country. Editors are legion, if not always acute. Defects in the contributors and contributions there also must be in a world like ours. Yet that has not prevented a literary flood of substantial proportions from sweeping over all. The high water caused by the appearing of many volumes and pamphlets with sermonic material is receding gradually since the new world war has made itself felt, absorbing both the time and thought of serious-minded men. Such a recent flood, however, has left behind its mark. So it can hardly be said that the church lacks penmen with ready pens.

"If the unpopularity of theological literature be due to neither editor nor author, then what else can be the cause of the present situation but our theological public? Denominational papers are much in evidence; devotional writings and commentaries on the Sunday school lessons vie one with the other on the market. But the theological magazine goes unheeded, unwanted, unsupported. Ministers must simply not be reading systematic theology or the Greek New Testament. They must not be expounding the Bible verse by verse, book by book, doctrine by doctrine. Both pulpit and pew, therefore, need revival, not the pew alone. Clergymen may be too busy with things of less importance than 'prayer and the ministry of the Word' (Acts 6:4). They may be acting out the part of deacon (Acts 6:2), of statesman (to plan 'a just and durable peace'), or of religious politician (to unite denominations, missions, schools).

"When will 'the cloth' come to its senses and learn again what our Lord meant by the words: 'Thou art careful and troubled about many things; but one thing is needful'? The minister is no better than what he does. If he fails to study the Bible and theology, what will he have of spiritual verity to preach? What message will he have for the war widow, the fatherless, the fighting man ready for combat? How can he support his country at war with prevailing prayer, if he knows so little about the God of glory and battles, revealed fully only in the Scriptures? How can he proclaim a gospel of peace which transforms men whose father is the devil into sons of God, thus to make possible what is real peace, both individual and national? Only, we believe, by knowing whereof he speaks, studying in order to know, having the material with which to study, and using it."

A.

Roman Catholic Marriage Documents

A brother kindly sent us the complete text of the documents on the signing of which the Roman Catholic Church insists in the case of mixed marriages. Our pastors should be acquainted with this text.—
Ed. NOTE.

Agreement and Promise to Be Signed by the Catholic Party

I, the undersigned, a member of the Catholic Church, wishing to contract marriage with the non-Catholic party whose signature is affixed above to this mutual agreement, being of sound mind and perfectly free, and only after understanding fully the import of my action, do hereby enter into this mutual agreement and understanding in contemplation of and in consideration for the consent, marriage, and consequent change of my status, and therefore hereby agree:

1. that I shall have all children, both boys and girls, that may be born of this union, baptized and educated solely in the faith of the Roman Catholic Church. I understand that in case of my death, or in the event of a dispute, the custody of all the children shall be given to such guardians as assure the faithful execution of this covenant and promise;
2. that I will practice my Catholic religion faithfully and will strive, especially by example, prayer, and the frequentation of the Sacraments, to bring about the conversion of my consort;
3. that no other marriage ceremony shall take place before or after this ceremony by the Catholic priest;
4. that I will lead a married life in conformity with the teachings of the Catholic Church regarding birth control, realizing fully the attitude of the Catholic Church in this regard.

Date _____

(Signature of Catholic party)

I, the undersigned pastor (assistant), do hereby attest: that the party whose signature is affixed to the above agreement and promises appeared before me personally on the given date; that I fully explained the import and meaning of the above agreement and promises, and that the said party freely entered into this agreement and signed the above in my presence. I have absolutely no hesitancy in attesting to the fact that the above-mentioned party is sincere in entering into this agreement and in the intention of faithfully executing the promises therein contained.

Pastor — Assistant

SEAL

Agreement and Promise to Be Signed by Non-Catholic Party

I, the undersigned, not a member of the Catholic Church, wishing to contract marriage with the Catholic party whose signature is also affixed to this mutual agreement, being of sound mind and perfectly free, and only after understanding fully the import of my action, do hereby enter into this mutual agreement, understanding the execution of this agree-

ment and the promises therein contained are made in contemplation of and in consideration for the consent, marriage, and consequent change of status of the hereinafter mentioned Catholic party, and I, therefore, hereby agree:

1. that I will not interfere in the least with the free exercise of the Catholic party's religion;
2. that I will adhere to the doctrine of the sacred indissolubility of the marriage bond, so that I cannot contract a second marriage while my consort is still alive, even though a civil divorce may have been obtained;
3. that all the children, both boys and girls, that may be born of this union shall be baptized and educated solely in the faith of the Roman Catholic Church, even in the event of the death of my Catholic consort. In case of dispute, I furthermore hereby agree fully that the custody of all the children shall be given to such guardians as assure the faithful execution of this covenant and promise in the event that I cannot fulfill it myself;
4. that I will lead a married life in conformity with the teachings of the Catholic Church regarding birth control, realizing fully the attitude of the Catholic Church in this regard;
5. that no other marriage ceremony shall take place before or after this ceremony by the Catholic priest.

In testimony of which agreement, I do hereby solemnly swear that I will observe the above agreement and faithfully execute the promises therein contained, and do now affix my signature in approval thereof.

Date _____

(Signature of non-Catholic party)

I, the undersigned pastor (assistant), do hereby attest: that the party whose signature is affixed to the above agreement and promises appeared before me personally on the given date; that I fully explained the import and meaning of the above agreement and promises, and that the said party, duly sworn, freely entered into this agreement and signed the above in my presence. I have absolutely no hesitancy in attesting to the fact that the above-mentioned party is sincere in entering into this agreement and in the intention of faithfully executing the promises therein contained.

Pastor — Assistant

SEAL

A Protestant Voice from Latin America

In the *Watchman-Examiner* Thomas Dixon, a missionary to El Salvador, speaks of the attacks that have been made on Protestant missions in Latin America and submits his reaction to them. On account of the prominence which in the press has been given to Roman Catholic opposition to Protestant mission work in the countries south of the United States, we think it proper to submit to our readers what this Protestant missionary writes.

"We trust that none of you will be tricked into believing the propaganda being made against Protestant missions in Latin America. It is being said that we are causing a great deal of ill feeling towards the United States because we are proselytizing Roman Catholics. This is certainly not so here, nor anywhere where I have been. In fact, I believe that the missionaries are as a rule a very real aid to good understanding and good feeling. Seldom do other folk from the States mix with the people or spend themselves in helping them as do the missionaries. Amongst all classes of people we have an ever-growing number of friends, and we are treated with splendid cordiality everywhere.

"If we were so obnoxious as is being said, these countries themselves have an easy remedy. They could simply reform their constitution so as to exclude us, but the very fact that they have opened their countries to us and welcomed us and sanctioned our work amongst them gives the lie to the propaganda made against us. I have spoken to several men about this—some very prominent men—and they all deny that we are disliked, and some of them have spoken in strong terms against those who say so. In Santa Ana, San Salvador, and in Managua, Nicaragua, our schools receive many students from very prominent families, and we are always filled to overflowing long before the official time for matriculation is over. Strange, if we are so disliked!

"Of course, the United States will never be very well liked by the Roman Catholic Church as long as her people do not place themselves in submission to the Pope. Let me translate a paragraph that appeared in a local paper recently during the first Eucharistic Congress of Central America; here it is: 'The laity, as I have said, . . . secularized the cemeteries, established civil marriage, suppressed religious education, that is, the control of education by the Church, and made a constitution that is indifferent to the Catholic faith, which through our Spanish heritage flows in our veins. . . . And there is given to the face of the earth the greatest of absurdities: a secular state in a Catholic country.'

"You can see for yourselves who is making the hullabaloo and why. You can also see what the Roman Catholic Church wants: control of the cemeteries, of marriage, of education, a constitution recognizing only the Roman Catholic faith, and a laity submissive to a state controlled by Rome. It is 'absurd' to this Roman Catholic spokesman for the people in these countries to control their own government—that should be left to the priests. The laity, however, established their government and made their constitution as they wanted it, and made it so that they might be free to worship God as they pleased. Therefore, since these folk will not keep us out, the Roman Catholics turn to our United States Government and try to persuade it that the 'good neighbor' policy is doomed if Uncle Sam sends his Protestant missionaries down here to irritate the clergy. Do not you believe it!

"One man, not of this country, but a former Vice-President of his own country and a member of its Supreme Court, said: 'That is not true. It is the propaganda worked up by these Spanish priests (those from Spain). I believe we all feel that it is best to have all religions present, as they thus keep one another purer.'

"We should like to recommend to you a splendid book on Latin America by Dr. W. Stanley Rycroft, executive secretary of the committee on co-operation. He has been here in our home and left a most favorable impression. For seventeen years he was a missionary in Peru, and for fifteen years he taught English in the university there. His book is authoritative and very informing. You all should read it. It is entitled: *On This Foundation: The Evangelical Witness in Latin America*, by W. Stanley Rycroft, published by the Friendship Press, New York City."

A.

The Westminster Assembly

From the *Presbyterian* we take over the following interesting remarks on the Westminster Assembly, which was responsible for the famous Westminster Confession:

"In the spring of 1643 Church and State in England were falling apart. Parties and plots were rife. Armies were maneuvering. The Great Seal had gone to the King, and Parliament ordered another for its own use. The Church, the Presbyterians, and the Sects were in one another's hair. To assist Parliament in this difficult and dangerous posture of affairs, it was ordered that an Assembly of Divines be convened to sit at Westminster and act as a chamber of reference for matters doctrinal and ecclesiastical. This group convened on July 1, 1643, in Westminster Abbey, and began a nine years' tenure of life. Scottish ministers were invited and came. Episcopalians were invited, but did not come or, when they arrived, were expelled. Revision of the Thirty-nine Articles was the original agenda, but time and need brought much else before this august tribunal. It set about to displace episcopacy. Thirty members came from the Houses of Parliament, but their attendance was perfunctory. Puritan divines filled the benches. The Scottish Covenant was a great problem, and the General Assembly in Scotland was vocal with suggestions. Among the one hundred and fifty members there were Presbyterians, Dissenters, and Independents. (Cf. W. C. Abbott's *Life and Letters of Cromwell*, Volume I.) There is something suggestive in the fact that as we approach the celebration of the three hundredth anniversary of the gathering of this notable group, we should be in the midst of an effort to adopt Episcopalianism into our system and establish bishops among our presbyters."

A.



Theological Observer

Conference of Lutheran Seminary Professors.—From June 9 to 11 Augustana Theological Seminary at Rock Island, Ill., was host to a gathering of professors teaching at Lutheran seminaries in the United States and Canada. The meeting was a free, informal conference of professional men, studying problems of a more or less technical nature, for instance, such as have to do with the curriculum and methods of instruction. Most of the Lutheran seminaries in our and the neighboring country to the north were represented. From Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Dr. Theo. Graebner and the undersigned had come. The beautiful location of Augustana College and Seminary on the bluffs of the Mississippi and the gracious hospitality of the seminary authorities made the external circumstances most delightful. Three papers were read and discussed. Dr. A. R. Wentz, president of the Theological Seminary at Gettysburg, had written a paper on the subject "The Curriculum of Theological Education"; in his absence this paper was read by his colleague Dr. Hein. Dr. B. M. Christensen, president of Augsburg Seminary, read a paper on "Academic Freedom and Scientific Approach to Theology"; and the undersigned submitted a paper on "The Seminary and the Church." Sectional meetings for instructors in the various branches of theology had been arranged. Devotional addresses were delivered by Drs. Fisher, Flack, and Bodensieck. Now and then it became apparent that the representatives of Lutheranism in America are not yet in doctrinal agreement. The undersigned, however, cherishes the hope that meetings like this one, furnishing an opportunity of contact between men of different synods, will help to advance the cause of the unity which all desire. The character of the conference as a free gathering, involving no commitments as to church fellowship, is to be maintained. Next year it will assemble in Dubuque, Iowa, as the guest of Wartburg Seminary.

W. ARNDT

On Loyalty to the Scriptures and the Pure Doctrine.—When our Norwegian brethren met for their synodical convention this year, the opening sermon was preached by the Rev. A. M. Harstad. The sermon is published in the *Lutheran Sentinel* of June 12. His text was 1 Thess. 2:4. On account of the importance of the sentiments expressed in the second part of the sermon we reprint here a number of its paragraphs. Every member of the Missouri Synod will give his hearty assent to what is there stated.

"There is in everyone by nature the spirit of rebellion against the principle of Scripture alone. That our human reason should not be allowed to decide what is to be doctrine the flesh does not like. We are all prone to want to follow our own ideas. To give them up and follow Scripture alone is displeasing to the natural man.

"It would be very easy to slip into the way of wanting to please men and therefore to give up our strict adherence to Scriptural doctrine and cease to speak and warn against false doctrine. In so doing, we would probably be pleasing men and might attain to success before the world.

And we are so prone to want to make a god out of worldly success and sacrifice doctrine and principles on the altar of this god success.

"But we would not then be pleasing God. And He is the one who trieth our hearts. He is the Judge before whom we shall either stand or fall. When we have come to the end of the road and must leave this world, then the question will not be: Did he win the approval of men? but: Was he faithful to the Word of God? Did he run his course in the manner which God has pointed out? Nothing else really matters.

"We shall fulfill our God-given trust by being faithful in maintaining that with which we have been entrusted. While we know that with the world these principles for which our Synod stands will not be popular, yet with us they should be popular. While they do not win the approval of the world, yet they should win our approval. We are not to be of the world, but we are to have the Spirit of Christ.

"We shall fulfill our sacred trust by upholding the honor of the doctrine which we preach both by word and by deed. Others will be looking at us to see what kind of lives we lead. Some even say, 'Oh, you Synod people don't care how a person lives, because he is saved by grace anyway.' So they slander our doctrine of salvation by grace as leading to carelessness of life. It isn't true. The Biblical doctrine makes a person thankful to God for saving him, begets love to God and therefore a desire to live a godly life. Faith in the grace of God is the mother of every good work. We have a great responsibility to adorn the doctrine which we profess with a godly life." A.

Some Sturdy Norwegian Leaders.—From the *Lutheran Sentinel* of June 12 we reprint a few paragraphs constituting a report written by the Rev. M. H. Otto, in which three of the early Norwegian pastors of our country are characterized. These men deserve to be held in fond remembrance by our generation and to be regarded by us as exemplars of loyalty to Lutheran principles. Pastor Otto writes:

"At our recent synodical convention the devotions on three mornings were devoted to sketches on the lives of some of our Synod's fathers. The Rev. A. Strand prepared one of these on the basis of Ps. 119:3, 4. The Psalmist had a zeal governed by proper knowledge. The same can be said of Herman Amber Preus, president of our Synod from 1862—1894. He preached what he believed in his heart. The person and work of Christ and the grace of God in Christ stand out in all his sermons. Times may have changed, but the principles he stood for have not. There should be the same eagerness in our work today. This hero of faith preached the Gospel in such a way, as to make any false way show itself up as undesirable. O God, make us faithful, zealous, filled with knowledge and understanding!

"On the basis of John 8:31, 32, the Rev. G. A. R. Gullixson paid tribute to the Rev. J. A. Ottesen, who spent much of his ministry serving congregations at Koshkonong, Wis. While he may not have been the captain, he could well be called the navigator of our Church in its early days. His entire ministry was connected with the history of our Synod. As a spiritual giant of keen intellect, he fought and stood for the truth of Holy Scripture. One of this sainted father's last prayers for our

Synod was this: 'God grant that our Church may ever deserve the praise that it continues in God's Word.'

"A memorial to Dr. Ulrik Vilhelm Koren was prepared by the Rev. T. N. Teigen on the basis of Rev. 2:1-7. He was a practical pastor, a thorough student of Scripture, with a ready pen. He considered our greatest glory this, that we have the pure Word of God; his greatest fear was that we might lose the truth. With every passing year he marveled that God had let His Word and truth remain with us so long. Rightly does he deserve to be called the 'Walther' of the Norwegian Synod." A.

An Evaluation of Liberalism.—In an article appearing in the *Christian Century* the editor of that liberal journal discusses a book that has recently appeared, *A Realistic Philosophy of Religion*, by A. Campbell Garnett. He states in beginning his comments: "Many signs indicate that we are entering a period of intense controversy between Christianity and the dominant philosophy of Modernism. This philosophy, which calls itself by various names—naturalism, humanism, positivism, etc.—has brought congenial affinities with modern culture and a pronounced distaste for orthodox Christianity, which it regards as an inhibition upon the free exercises of intelligence." This description of Modernism, though not comprehensive enough, generally speaking, is pertinent. But it must be noted that Dr. Morrison uses the term to denote definitely and outspokenly antichristian positions. As to Christianity, Dr. Morrison holds that it is divided into three camps. "On the extreme right is Fundamentalism, or pseudo-orthodoxy, which opposes Modernism with a wooden and sterile literalism. On the extreme left are the humanists, who have capitulated to it. In the center are the liberals and conservatives. These may be distinguished from each other by the relative proportions in which they are, respectively, able to mix the Christian faith with modernist ingredients."

Next the editor speaks of the intense controversy he holds is in the offing. "The controversy which is now coming into the open has been precipitated by a revolt of the center. But this revolt can be understood only as it is seen to arise from the liberal side of the center, not from the conservative side. Conservatism, in contrast with Fundamentalism, has sought to maintain orthodoxy in the dignity in which historical theology has presented it. Its eyes rested mainly upon the noble past. Its traffic with Modernism has therefore been minimal." Dr. Morrison holds that in the liberal sector of the Christian center "a radical reaction is now going on against the compromise which liberal Christianity has made with the claims of Modernism. These claims are being challenged not only in the name of historical Christianity, but in the name of civilization. Many liberal thinkers have arisen who have diagnosed the disease of our civilization as primarily due to the anthropocentric character of modern culture, and have called the Church, each in his own way, back to the theocentric faith of historical Christianity. These Christian liberals have themselves come up through Modernism and can speak its language as the more static half of Christian orthodoxy cannot speak it. Scientists and philosophers who have long held aloof

from Christian theology with indulgent indifference are just now beginning to read theological books! What they find there has so aroused them that they are calling Christianity dangerous!" In this connection Dr. Morrison expresses himself on the origin and development of liberalism: "There are three main factors which have produced Christian liberalism: the biological doctrine of evolution, the higher criticism of the Bible, and the psychology of religion. To the first two, orthodoxy, led by liberalism, has long since made a satisfactory adjustment. And liberalism had led Christian thought far on the way to a similar adjustment with psychology when the present revolt against the claims of psychology arose within the ranks of liberalism itself. Psychology has tended strongly to displace history in Christian thinking, and the instinctive protest of Christian faith was inevitable. For it has been the very genius of Christianity from its beginning that it has conceived itself as a historical religion, that is, as a revelation of the meaning of history once for all made in history."

Dr. Morrison points out that the book which he reviews is intended to explain and defend the Christian religion "on the basis of the psychology of religion without benefit of any revelation in history."

The new book, according to the reviewer, tries to go back to the very foundations of religion. It states, as many recent investigators have done, that religion arises in moral experience. Dr. Morrison objects that "the Church and revelation" are ignored. We have quoted rather copiously to give our readers a little insight into the modes of thinking and arguing followed by Modernists. After all, the religion which they adopt and cultivate is that of the human mind, of reason, which speculates and applauds itself on its profundities. Dr. Morrison's own position is not far different, because, though he speaks of revelation as an important factor, what he has in mind is not the Scripture as the Word of God, but "God's action in history." Christians have always taught that God reveals Himself in history, but they have, wherever they remained loyal to the old moorings, added that the supreme revelation of God is given us in Christ and in the inerrant Word. A.

Dr. Buttrick of the Federal Council.—There is no doubt that the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America is gaining rapidly in strength and influence. It claims to represent American Protestantism. It controls largely the appointment of Protestant chaplains. It regulates the radio in its Protestant aspect, Dr. H. E. Fosdick and Dr. R. W. Sockman being the official Protestant radio speakers. In 1939 Dr. G. A. Buttrick was elected to the presidency of the Federal Council. Dr. Buttrick is pastor of the Madison Avenue Presbyterian Church, New York. He is a signer of the infamous Auburn Affirmation and a member of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. In 1938 he gave the anniversary address before the 150th General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A. As he spoke, his very popular book *The Christian Fact and Modern Doubt* was on sale in the vestibule of Convention Hall, Philadelphia. *The Christian Beacon* (April 8, 1943), mentioning these facts, produces in the same issue some excerpts showing Dr. Buttrick's undisguised infidelity. Writing on the authority of the Bible, he says: "It [the Bible] comprises *myths by which the stories of*

Mount Olympus or the City of Asgard are cast in shade, tales more gallant than those of Arthur's Court, songs that are the music of the soul, dramas that might be a Sophocles' despair." (Italics ours.) Or: "But as long as historical criticism is deemed invalid and every 'apocalypse' is the direct 'word of God,' the doomsters will plague us. What minister visiting a college campus but has found religion discredited by bibliolatry? Genesis is the 'word of God,' the argument runs, but the indubitable findings of science make Genesis seem absurd: so religion is a dream and an anachronism. Not all churches yet give clear guidance." Or: "Literal infallibility of Scripture is a fortress impossible to defend: there is treason in the camp. Probably few people who claim to 'believe every word of the Bible' really mean it. *That avowal held to its last logic would risk a trip to the insane asylum.*" (Italics by *Christian Beacon*.) Touching on the imputation of Adam's guilt to his descendants, Dr. Buttrick remarks: "Such a God . . . had earned the verdict of the French sceptic: 'Your God is my devil.'" We shall not continue to enumerate the rank blasphemies of this unbeliever, but certainly the American Council of Christian Churches is right when it insists that the Federal Council, led by such unbelievers as Buttrick, Fosdick, Sockman, and others, has no right to represent Protestantism in America and has no right to usurp the privilege of the Protestant radio hour to disseminate its unbelief and has no right to control the appointment of Army and Navy chaplains. Let those who condemn the adherents of the American Council of Christian Churches as too vocal only contemplate how much more vocal infidelity, as represented by the Federal Council, is in our country and how surely it will go on and on to deceive unwary Christians unless it is exposed in its ungodly attitude and heinous infidelity.

J. T. M.

The American Scientific Affiliation.—*The Calvin Forum* (May, 1943) reports editorially on the status of the American Scientific Affiliation, of which, we are sure, our readers will read with great joy. The following is said about its organization: "Through the week of September 2, 1941, there met in Chicago a group of five men of standing in their respective branches of science. Four of them are professors in recognized institutions of higher learning, and the fifth was on the faculty of the largest university of the country until recently, when he entered the industrial field. Two of them are heads of their departments. They are typical college professors; in addition, they are wholehearted Christians. They met to discuss some problems common to them all." The "A. S. A." booklet, from which this is taken, further declares: "Nineteenth- and twentieth-century science has brought forth some remarkable evidence substantiating the reliability of the Holy Scriptures. This same science has also brought in a destructive materialistic philosophy, which is leaving a scar upon our civilization. An excellent method of combating the latter is to make known the former, and to this task this new organization of Christian men of science brings its rigorous thinking, specialized training, and humble faith." Explaining the objective of the group more fully, the editor writes: "One of the five men mentioned in the preceding paragraphs was Dr. J. P. Van Haltsma of Calvin College; the others hailed from California, Massachusetts, and

Pennsylvania. Their discussions concerned the faith of students subjected to materialistic campus influences and the unscientific defense of the Bible often found in books and pamphlets produced by well-meaning Christian authors. How to help these students and authors, was the question considered. Suggested plans for future activity were: to publish a handbook for college students, to review Christian books on science, to conduct a scientific summer school for Christian workers and educators, to write literature on scientific subjects and to spread accurate literature." Membership is restricted to such persons as are scientifically qualified and subscribe to the creed of the organization, which reads: "I believe in the whole Bible, as originally given, to be the inspired word of God, the only unerring guide of faith and conduct. Since God is the Author of this Book as well as the Creator and Sustainer of the physical world about us, I cannot conceive of discrepancies between statements in the Bible and the real facts of science. Accordingly, trusting in the Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, my Savior, for strength, I pledge myself as a member of this organization to the furtherance of its task." National meetings were to be held annually, but on January 1, 1943, the chairman, F. Alton Everest, wrote to the members and prospective members that "the war has temporarily changed the original emphasis of national conventions with auxiliary regional meetings to regional meetings with no national conventions." Eight such regional meetings have been held since the time of organization; five in California, two in Chicago, and one in Boston. The article says in conclusion: "The organization is young, and the war has interfered with some of its original plans, but the leaders are men of devotion, energy, and enthusiasm. No doubt, we shall hear more from this affiliation." Just now when the world war with its many earnest lessons and serious problems is making thousands receptive to listening to the truth who otherwise never would have troubled themselves about spiritual values, the affiliation will find much opportunity to do effective witnessing work. May its endeavors be crowned with success. The spirit of the organization, judged by its creed, certainly is most excellent. J. T. M.

Peace Negotiations and the Church.—Very properly our press and our statesmen are directing the thoughts of our people and those of other nations to the discussions which will have to come when the last gun of the war has been fired and the peace treaty is to be drawn up. In some quarters the thought has been voiced strongly that at the table where the delegates of the various nations will be seated to confer on the terms of peace treaty spokesmen of the Church should be given a place and an opportunity for offering suggestions. People who express such a thought undoubtedly mean well, but in our view the course which they advocate is entirely erroneous. In the *Living Church* (Episcopal) a lengthy editorial deals with the topic "The Church at the Peace Conference," and the sentiments expressed there are so sane that we must not withhold at least some of the salient paragraphs from our readers.

"It seems to us that a delegation at the peace conference specifically labeled 'Christian Churches,' whether its members were advisers or delegates, . . . could do no good, and might do much harm. In the first

place, what weight could be assigned to the opinions of such a delegation? If it were defending its own material and practical interests (such as, let us say, title to church property which had been seized by the enemy), it would, no doubt, speak with the full authority of the bodies it represented. If, on the other hand, it attempted to go into political questions, there is grave doubt whether it could possibly represent the membership of the churches. Political, economic, and social questions, while they are closely related to Christian principles, cannot be answered merely by reference thereto; and there are almost as many opinions within the Church as outside it about each problem in these spheres. The church delegation, if it attempted to advocate concrete proposals of a political nature, would find itself loudly disclaimed by leading church people outside its membership. Indeed, it is quite possible that the delegation itself would be unable to agree to much of anything and would cut a sorry figure among the more worldly negotiators who know what they want and can marshal support to get it."

After pointing to the difficulty which will confront the peace conference on account of the conflicting claims of Poland and Russia, the editorial continues, "What purpose would a church delegation serve in such an assembly? Would it be there to associate the Church with compromised and expedient decisions based on the power of the nation offering them? Or would its function be to keep silence in controversial issues, merely protesting when flagrant injustice is attempted, and perhaps walking out and withdrawing the mantle of religion which it had too hastily thrown over the affairs of nations? It seems likely, from the ethical point of view, that the peace will be not unlike the peace of 1919—although, from the practical point of view, we hope that it will be much stronger. Justice will be done in some quarters; in others, injustice. In some matters it will be quite impossible to establish a normal justice. A religious delegation, it seems to us, could only work mischief in such an assembly. It could not prevent injustice, partly because much of it will not look like injustice at the time, but chiefly because the Christian trumpet gives forth an uncertain sound in political matters and hard-headed statesmen will not pay any attention to it. Because of the absolute character of the Church's message on right and wrong, the delegation would either have to use the prestige of the Church to countenance wrong or condemn the conference *in toto* and thus, perhaps, wreck the embryonic order of nations before it had a chance to develop."

We hope the Church will not forget the saying of Jesus addressed to Pontius Pilate, "My kingdom is not of this world." Let the Church adhere to its function, the preaching of the Word. It will have to exert its influence at the peace conference indirectly, bringing people to Christ and putting Christian principles into their hearts so that, when they are called upon to act as political leaders, the ideals which they will follow will be as much as possible in keeping with the great tenets of justice and love laid down in the Holy Scriptures. A.

The Returned Soldiers.—Under the caption "When the Heroes Come Home" the *Christian Century* publishes an editorial which one cannot but read with alarm. The editor says: "Reflective churchmen must have

read with apprehension reports which came out of Detroit last week. There the psychiatrists of the nation heard Army and Navy doctors tell their annual convention what the war has done to men in service, and particularly to the men who were in action on New Guinea and Guadalcanal. Even from the abridged accounts carried by the Associated Press it is evident that the American troops who have been in action in the South Pacific have passed through an experience which has had devastating psychological effects such as the nation had not begun to imagine. The medical men who have had to care for these veterans of jungle warfare tell of airmen mentally unbalanced by the tasks assigned them of 'strafing' defenseless ground troops. They tell of soldiers, specially chosen and toughened for these campaigns, behaving like madmen on the hospital ships bringing them back to this country. After six months of complete rest, the doctors say, some of them may again be fit for limited military duty. 'But,' according to the A. P., 'it is now considered doubtful that any of them can go back into the kind of action they faced.' Heroes returning from the front did not want to talk much after the last war. Apparently those returning from this war *can't* talk much; that way madness lies."

It is a sad topic, but our pastors have to face it because some of their parishioners, now serving in the armed forces, may when they return be in the condition of psychological disintegration described here. If anywhere, it is in these cases that a pastor's wisdom will be taxed to the utmost. A.

Brief Items. — "The commercial wedding and the stunt marriage are so far outside the meaning of the solemnization of holy matrimony that the priest gains respect for the Church by turning his back on them." (From an editorial in the *Living Church*, Episcopalian weekly.)

According to the Catholic census, giving the strength of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States, Alaska, and Hawaii for 1942, the number of adherents of that Church at the close of last year was 22,945,247, a gain of 389,005 (almost 2 per cent) over the census figures for 1941. The report says that of the accessions 86,905, that is, about 20 per cent, represent conversions and that this number of converts to be gained in one year is the largest in the history of the Church in the United States.

To help our readers in evaluating religious news items, we here state briefly once more that there are now three larger Protestant federations: Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America; the American Council of Christian Churches; and the National Association of Evangelicals. The latter Association is accused by Fundamentalists of being unwilling to take a stand against the Federal Council.

A Federal court in California dismissed a suit to revoke the voting rights of certain California Japanese. The charge of the man who brought the suit was that "dishonesty, deceit, and hypocrisy are racial characteristics of the Japanese." When an appeal was taken, the decision of the lower court was upheld by the Circuit Court and the United States Supreme Court. A.

Book Review

All books reviewed in this periodical may be procured from or through Concordia Publishing House, 3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

The Five Books of Moses. A re-examination of the modern theory that the Pentateuch is a late compilation from diverse and conflicting sources by authors and editors whose identity is completely unknown. By Oswald T. Allis. The Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, Philadelphia. 1943. 319 pages, 5¾×8½. Price, \$3.00.

This is a very valuable work, which we recommend heartily to readers who are interested in modern Biblical criticism and are looking for an up-to-date presentation of the true conservative standpoint over against modern, radical higher criticism. Professor Oswald T. Allis is well known in our country as a learned and thoroughgoing scholar in the Old Testament field. He belongs to that famous group of Princeton scholars and is, one might say, the successor of William Henry Green, the "Hengstenberg of North America," Robert Dick Wilson, the best modern conservative scholar in the field of the prophetic books, especially with regard to the historicity and authenticity of Daniel, and John D. Davis, the well-known author of *A Dictionary of the Bible*, a unique production written by one scholar. Dr. Allis taught at Princeton from 1910 to 1929, during twelve years of which he was faculty editor of the *Princeton Theological Review*, well-known for its conservative and yet thoroughgoing scholarship, for which also our Dr. Pieper wrote an article on Luther's doctrine of inspiration. Allis severed his connection with Princeton when the attitude of the faculty became more and more liberal, and was then for seven years Professor of the Old Testament at Westminster Theological Seminary. He is now retired.

In the present work he presents a re-examination of an important and widely accepted theory in the light of modern scholarship and of the archaeological discoveries of recent years, especially of the last decade, which have been so remarkable that they have produced almost an archaeological revolution and have caused not a few to admit or assert that the conclusions of higher criticism must be considerably revised. No one who has read Dr. Allis' articles and reviews, as the present reviewer has read them for years, will doubt his competence to discuss this most important problem of Old Testament criticism, the writing of the Pentateuch. While Dr. R. H. Pfeiffer of Harvard, the author of the most recent *Critical Introduction of the Old Testament* [1941], still maintains that all the laws in the Pentateuch are post-Mosaic and that the final publication of the Pentateuch was not made until about 400 B. C., or about a millennium after the death of Moses, Dr. Allis shows that these laws and the Pentateuch which contains them were attributed to Moses because they were of Mosaic origin, and that the objections to this view made by the higher critics are without any adequate basis in fact.

The book consists, besides a lengthy introduction, of three parts:

First, the documentary hypothesis; second, the development or Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis; third, the present state of the problem. Three appendices are added, followed by copious and very valuable notes, and a double index of authors and subjects and of Bible passages. Throughout the book, Allis upholds over against naturalism and the evolutionary theory the supernatural character and the divine revelation of the Old Testament. Professor Albright, a well-known modern scholar and excavator, states in his book *From the Stone Age to Christianity* that it is his aim "to show how man's idea of God developed from pre-historic antiquity to the time of Christ and to place this development in its historical context." Over against such a theory Allis upholds and defends the truth. In the last sentence of the book Allis states, "that the Pentateuch is not a late, anonymous, untrustworthy composite, but is correctly described as 'The Five Books of Moses,' the man of God. And those who hold this time-honored and thoroughly Biblical view may well rejoice that they are today in a far better position to give a reason for believing that Moses wrote the Pentateuch than was the case a century or even a generation ago" (p. 254). In the chapter on "The Pentateuch and Archaeology" he mentions the most notable discoveries within the forty years of the present century, the Code of Hammurapi (1901), the Assuan and Elephantine Papyri (1904), the Hittite discoveries at Boghazkeui (1906), the tomb of Tutankamon (1922), the sarcophagus of Ahiram (1923), the Ras Shamra alphabet texts (1929), the Chester Beatty papyri (1930). In the last chapter he speaks of the final question "What Think Ye of Christ?" and he confesses unreservedly his faith in the Virgin Birth and in the resurrection of Christ. We would like to give more quotations from this excellent work, but must close with a cordial recommendation of the book to our readers.

L. FUERBRINGER

A Digest of Christian Thinking. By Charles S. Macfarland. 192 pages. 5×7¼. Revell Company, New York.

This is the 1942 volume in the series begun by Dr. Macfarland, now emeritus secretary of the Federal Council of Churches, in 1936. The word "Digest" in the title is used in the broader sense without any implication of systematic or critical treatment of the books surveyed in this series. Properly speaking, the volume is a review of significant books which have appeared in the recent past, so that a digest of them will give an overview of the religious thought of our day. The author classes himself with the "conservatively and preservatively liberal," but his theology definitely colors the entire book with a liberal, i. e., radical, hue. When Edwin Lewis, in one of the books here reviewed, calls "the identification of every bit of social change with the Kingdom of God," "a pernicious modern custom" the author calls this "a gratuitous intrusion." He expresses his doubt whether Jesus identified Himself with "the Son of Man of the apocalypses." And the fact that out of the great mass of literature published in one year Macfarland selects almost exclusively books of the liberal sort not only characterizes the volume as itself a bit of modernistic propaganda, but certainly detracts from its value as a guide to contemporary religious thought. If one did not know that there is a great ground swell of conservatism

going through the Reformed bodies, one would take nothing but a feeling of depression from the reading of this Digest.

Sometimes we don't know whether it is Macfarland who speaks or the author whom he reviews. But if we build into something of a system the ideas which according to the forty-two volumes here passed in review make up 1942 Christianity, we get this picture: "The literalistic error of insisting on the Fall as an historic event has brought confusion on the relation of man's essential nature to his sinful condition." "The idea of a Fall from an original state of perfection is not a scientific statement about the dawn of history." "No authoritarian faith can be made personal." "The idea of total depravity has no place in the teaching of Jesus." "Authoritarianism in theology is a peril to true Christian education." "There is no single authoritative interpretation of the Christian faith in the New Testament." The Federal Council's statements have been "simple and clear expressions of traditional Christianity." "The mission of the Church is that of being a leaven in national policy." Finally: "Protestants share with Catholics the acceptance of a written revelation, progressively interpreted in the course of history." Aside from a good appraisal of Progressive Education (in a review of Smith's *Faith and Nurture*) and some valuable first-hand expressions from Roman Catholic sources on the principles of Church and State, we have gained little of permanent value from the reading of this volume.

TH. GRAEBNER

Mennonite Cyclopedic Dictionary. By Daniel Kauffman. Mennonite Publishing House, Scottdale, Pa. 443 pages, 6¼×9¼. Price, \$2.00.

Mennonites in Europe. By John Horsch. Mennonite Publishing House. 425 pages (with index), 6¼×9¼. Price, \$2.00.

To such as desire special information on the Mennonites in our country or their past history in Europe we warmly recommend these two books for careful study, though the non-Mennonite student will not find himself in agreement with all statements made in them. The *Cyclopedic Dictionary* is a compendium of doctrines, history, activities, literature, and environments of the Mennonite Church, especially in America, making available in alphabetical arrangement a wealth of information to the reader. It offers nearly a thousand biographical sketches of Mennonite leaders and Mennonite families in our country and descriptions of nearly five hundred places of historic interest. To the text proper there is added an interesting "Appendix," consisting of three main topics: 1. Mennonite Centers of Population with Illustrative Maps; 2. Source Material Used in Compiling the Book; and 3. Fifty Fundamental Doctrinal Facts with a Brief Analysis of Each. It somewhat corresponds to the *Concordia Cyclopedia*, though it is much narrower in its scope.

John Horsch's *Mennonites in Europe* is the first volume of a *Mennonite History* which is to be followed by a second, now in preparation, *Mennonites in America* (author, Harold S. Bender). Horsch has become favorably known in our circles chiefly by his excellent *Modern Religious Liberalism*, which is a classic in its field. Born at Giebelstadt, Germany, on December 18, 1867, he came to the United States in 1888 to escape

compulsory military training against which he had scruples of conscience. Here he served on various editorial staffs, but did his main work as editorial member of the Mennonite Publishing House, Scottsdale, Pa., where he served from 1908 to 1941, the year in which he died (Oct. 7). He was a devoted student of Mennonite history and for fifty years a prolific writer on all subjects relating to the Mennonites. He wrote both in German and English, and though he came to America when he was already set in his ways, he developed a style of writing in the language of the land which for simplicity, charm, and idiomatic perfection can hardly be excelled. As a historian Mr. Horsch, of course, writes from the viewpoint of a convinced Mennonite, and at times his judgments are hardly objective, as, for example, when he says that Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin did not approve the principle of general religious toleration (p. 3) or when he says that the Waldenses raised objections to the denial of free will and to the doctrine of predestination as taught by Luther and Zwingli. On both these points distinctions must be made, for Luther did not take the same position as did the Reformed leaders. Nor is it sufficient to say that Luther favored the "state church" as did the Reformed leaders. Luther knew well how to distinguish between Church and State and emphatically taught the separation of Church and State. The reason why there was no separation of Church and State in the so-called Lutheran countries must be sought in the circumstances over which the great Reformer had no control. Nevertheless, the book is a unique and thorough presentation of the Mennonites in Europe and a crowning achievement of the author's busy lifetime. John Horsch, by the way, was personally a diligent student of Luther, read the periodicals of our Church, and found daily nurture and soul strength in Luther's glorious explanation of the Second Article, as he wrote the reviewer shortly before his death. The book contains numerous pictures and illustrations, special "Notes and References," a carefully selected "Bibliography," and a helpful "Index." It belongs in every seminary library and should be read by all who study Mennonite history.

JOHN THEODORE MUELLER

The Quest for Preaching Power. By John Nicholls Booth. Published by The Macmillan Company, New York. 240 pages, 5¼×7¾. Price, \$2.00.

The title of this book is attractive; the book itself in answering the question suggested by the title is disappointing. Preaching receives its power by preaching the Word of God, especially the Gospel of Christ, of which it is said that it is "the power of God unto salvation." In the chapter "What Shall I Preach?" the author of this book fails deplorably to give the preacher the right direction. The fact that Mr. Booth is a Unitarian explains that deficiency.

He who in this book looks for some good things that may be said in reference to the technique of the sermon will find them. After all, the technique of the sermon is that of any speech or address. Among other things we are pleased to read that "the majority of our better-known preachers learn their address through the medium of the written manuscript," but that "the manuscript should not be carried into the

pulpit." To emphasize this advice Mr. Booth says, "Psychologists, conducting tests under laboratory conditions, have found that people retain that which is read to them with forty-nine per-cent efficiency. Retention increases to sixty-seven per cent when the thought is expressed, not by reading but by direct address" (p.222). What also gives value to the book is that it reveals the workshop technique of some of the outstanding pulpit speakers of our day. In this connection Mr. Booth says, "A number of our outstanding contemporary preachers who, it is logical to assume, possess a greater gift for sermon preparation than the majority of men, have informed me that they average from fifteen to twenty-five hours each week on their sermons" (p. 201).

J. H. C. FRITZ

Personality and Character Building. By Robert Stewart McElhinney and Henry Lester Smith. Published by Light and Life Press, Winona Lake, Ind. 345 pages, 5×7½.

Books on personality, character training, psychology of self, and similar topics are appearing on the market at regular intervals in our days. Some of these books have little or no value for the Lutheran educator and pastor, since they are based on the psychology of evolutionism. The present authors, both of whom belong to the faculty of Indiana University, have made a contribution to the study of the subject which will have a good deal of value, also for the Lutheran pastor. The discussion of character traits (p. 142 ff.) of the ideal teacher (p. 183), and the entire eighth chapter, "The Sources of Personality and Character," are well written and may well receive careful attention. We fully agree that States may have codes in the field of morality which have definite values for the citizens of the respective States. But the references of the authors to the Christian religion and to the person of Jesus Christ are inadequate throughout. The Christian religion is not a mere system of ethics, nor is Jesus Christ primarily a great example of perfect manhood. The heart of the Christian religion is the story of the Atonement wrought through the vicarious death of the Son of God on Calvary. Around this fact must revolve also every thought which deals with the life of sanctification. The Bible is the absolute criterion of truth also in the field of true morality. It offers both the proper motivation for a life of Christian service and the strength to live such a life out of love for the Savior. We hope to have a more detailed discussion of this important topic in the near future.

P. E. KRETZMANN

Home Builders of Tomorrow. By Warren D. Bowman, Ph.D. The Elgin Press, Elgin, Ill. 123 pages, 5×8. Price, \$1.00.

The practice of premarital counseling is gaining ground in our circles, chiefly because pastors who desire to be real shepherds to all the souls entrusted to them find that their services are sought and appreciated by young people of their congregations. A few pastors have already issued mimeographed sheets or brochures containing some of the most important counseling material in this field, and apparently such guidance has been gladly and thankfully received. The book here presented to the clergy will be welcomed by many men who have

been looking for authoritative information. The author treats the following subjects: Forming Friendships; The Choice of a Mate; Courtship; The Engagement; Entering upon Marriage. While we cannot agree with him that a valid betrothal can and may be broken (p. 80), since negative adjustments should be rectified before the consent of the parents is given, we feel that most of the material offered by him is worthy of the most careful study. We were particularly pleased with such statements as these: "Let there be three parties to the engagement, the young man, the young woman, and Christ" (p. 96); "The courtship should be held on a very high level and should not contain any of the intimacies that will cheapen one in the estimation of the other or cause lifelong regrets" (p. 64); "When a young man comes to marry, he does not want second hand goods for his wife and mother of his children, but he wants a pure girl who has not cheapened herself by petting with everyone who comes along" (p. 68); "When physical intimacy leads into prolonged petting, a strain is produced which may give way to immoral practices, and consequently lifelong regrets" (p. 70). There are numerous striking and valuable passages in the book which will cause a conscientious pastor to consult it frequently.

P. E. KRETZMANN

BOOKS RECEIVED

From Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids, Mich.:

The Biblical Basis of the Constitution. By Dan Gilbert, LL.D. 81 pages, $5\frac{1}{4} \times 7\frac{3}{4}$. Price, 50 cents.

20 Illustrated Object Lessons. By W. T. McLean. 46 pages, $5\frac{1}{4} \times 7\frac{3}{4}$. Price, 25 cents.

What Really Happened at Pearl Harbor? By Dan Gilbert. 48 pages, $5\frac{1}{4} \times 7\frac{3}{4}$. Price, 25 cents.

Hell over Hollywood. By Dan Gilbert. 50 pages, $5\frac{1}{4} \times 7\frac{3}{4}$. Price, 25 cents.

From Light and Life Press, Winona Lake, Ind.:

The Monk Who Lived Again. A Tale of South America. By B. H. Pearson. 185 pages, $5 \times 7\frac{1}{4}$.

From The Danielle Publishers, San Diego, Calif.:

The Real Fifth Column and How It Is Undermining America. By Dan Gilbert. 125 pages.

To Our Subscribers

It has been our custom to retain the names of our subscribers on our lists for two numbers after the subscription has expired, so that the subscriptions could be continued without interruption in case a renewal came in late. We were very happy to follow this plan at extra expense, but we are now unable to continue this policy because of present conditions.

Our Government has insisted that we reduce consumption of paper and eliminate all possible waste. Because of the restriction in the use of paper it will become necessary to discontinue subscriptions to all of our periodicals with the last number paid for under the subscription agreement. We shall, however, continue our policy of reminding our subscribers of the expiration of the subscription by inserting the usual number of notices in the second last and the last numbers of the periodicals they receive. It is our sincere hope that our subscribers will co-operate with us and the Government by renewing their subscriptions promptly upon receipt of the first notice.

June, 1943

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE